DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 998 CS 206 288

AUTHOR	Wagner, David L.
TITLE	ERIC First Analysis: Elementary and Secondary Education: 1981-82 National High School Debate Resolutions.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, Urbana, Ill.: Speech Communication Association, Annandale, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	81
CONTRACT	400-78-0026
NOTE	111p.: Tables may not reproduce well due to small type.
AVAILABLE FROM	Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Rd., Annandale, VA 22003 ($2.75 single copy, 10% discount on 10-49 copies, 20% discount on 50 or more copies).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Strategies: *Debate: *Educational Change: *Educational Finance: *Educational Improvement: Elementary Secondary Education: High Schools: *Minimum Competencies: Minimum Competency Testing: *Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS	*National High School Debate Resolutions

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this booklet is to provide a brief overview of the 1981-82 high school debate resolutions, which focus on minimum competencies, uniform financing, and standardized teacher certification as methods of improving the United States elementary and secondary education systems. The five chapters of the booklet are intended to prepare debaters for their own efficient investigation of the problem area. The five chapters are: (1) overview of current issues in elementary and secondary education, including an examination of federal, state, and local approaches to these issues: (2) the first resolution, minimum standards required for achieving an education: (3) the second resolution, school finance: (4) the third resolution, teacher certification: and (5) getting started, a review of useful information on researching the topic of education. At the end of the final chapter are footnotes for each chapter and selected bibliographies on the topic of elementary and secondary education. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ERIC First Analysis: Elementary and Secondary Education

ED200998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

1981–82 National High School Debate Resolutions

David L. Wagner
California State University, Sacramento

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills
National Institute of Education

Speech Communication Association
5105 Backlick Road, Annandale, Virginia 22003

CS206288

Speech Communication Association Publications Board: Robert R. Smith, *Chairperson*, Temple University; Lawrence Rosenfeld, University of New Mexico; Vicki Freimuth, University of Maryland; William Work, Speech Communication Association, *ex officio*

Speech Communication Module, ERIC/RCS: William Work, Module Director; Don M. Boileau, Associate Director; Penny Demo, Assistant Director

Staff Editor: Loreena P. Neumann

Published 1981 by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801, and the Speech Communication Association, 5105 Backlick Road, Annandale, Virginia 22003. Printed in the United States of America.

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education under contract no. 400-78-0026. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Speech Communication Association for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Speech Communication Association or the National Institute of Education.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 81-[illegible]734.

Contents

	Foreword	v
	The Problem Area and Debate Resolutions	vi
	Preface	vii
1.	The Problem Area: Elementary and Secondary Education	1
2.	Minimum Standards Resolution	13
3.	School Finance Resolution	44
4.	Teacher Certification Resolution	63
5.	Getting Started	83
	Notes	91
	Selected Bibliography	101

Foreword

ERIC First Analysis, published annually since 1973, provides debaters with guidelines for research on the debate resolutions selected by the National University Extension Association's Committee on Discussion and Debate. Periodic surveys of teachers of debate have indicated that *First Analysis* has proved to be an excellent resource for students in their study of issues and arguments. It incorporates an instructional approach designed to avoid "pat" cases and "canned" evidence.

Because these three debate resolutions need to be answered in each decade, debaters will be applying their attitudes and insights into educational policy issues many times in their adult life. The student who debates the minimum standards resolution must also face questions about the quality of the teaching staff and the financing of schools, so that whatever topic is initially selected, it will also require reading in the other topic areas. The extensive footnotes and bibliography represent the desire to place debaters in contact with original sources. The "analysis" concept is designed to create a framework for the debater, coach, and judge from which specific cases are developed. The sources and arguments used in the text reflect the quality which can be expected this year. The *ERIC First Analysis* should serve as a strong foundation for a productive clash of ideas and sources in developing and extending educational issues.

The *ERIC First Analysis* of the 1981-82 National High School Debate Resolutions is published by the Speech Communication Association in cooperation with the Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills (ERIC/RCS). The ERIC/RCS Clearinghouse is supported by the National Institute of Education which has as one of its missions the dissemination of knowledge to improve classroom practices. This ERIC information analysis paper is unique in that it is intended for direct use by high school students as well as by their teachers.

To be a "first" analysis, the manuscript must be prepared in a period of six weeks after the February announcement of the national debate topic. The author's thorough analysis of issues and sources in so short a time and his adaptation of the analysis to the needs of high school debaters are tributes to his experience and excellence as a forensics educator.

Don M. Boileau
Associate Director
Speech Module, ERIC/RCS

Bernard O'Donnell
Director
ERIC/RCS

1981–82 High School Debate Problem Area and Resolutions

How can the United States
elementary and secondary education systems
best be improved?

Debate Resolutions

Resolved: That the federal government should establish minimum educational standards for elementary and secondary schools in the United States.

Resolved: That a uniform system of financing elementary and secondary education in the United States should be adopted.

Resolved: That the federal government should establish national standards for the certification of elementary and secondary teachers.

Preface

The purpose of this publication is to provide a brief overview of the 1981-82 high school debate resolutions. The decision-making process for selecting the problem area and resolutions is vastly different from the system used for determining the college debate topic. Last December, the National University Extension Association (NUEA) Committee on Discussion and Debate offered three problem areas and nine resolutions for consideration. After six weeks of balloting by the various state and national forensic leagues, the education topic narrowly won the referendum. A final resolution, however, will not be determined until December 1981, although an early preference has been shown for the minimum standards and, to a lesser degree, the school finance resolutions. All of the specific resolutions are closely related to each other and many case areas are interchangeable.

Whichever resolution is finally selected, the debater will have a tremendous amount of research material to assimilate. The five chapters of this book are intended to prepare debaters for their own efficient investigation of the problem area. The five chapters are: (1) overview of current issues in elementary and secondary education including an examination of federal, state, and local approaches to these issues; (2) the first resolution, minimum standards required for achieving an education; (3) the second resolution, school finance; (4) the third resolution, teacher certification; and (5) getting started, a review of useful information on researching the topic of education. At the end of the final chapter are footnotes for each chapter and selected bibliographies on the topic of elementary and secondary education.

Since this text is written extremely early in the debate year, it can hardly encompass all possible cases which could be developed under any of the resolutions. This publication should be used to establish early research priorities on the most likely affirmative and negative arguments. Also, it is useful in providing a general overview of the type of issues likely to be discussed under the education topic.

The opinions expressed in this work do not represent the official position of either the NUEA or of the Speech Communication Association. In most instances the consensus view of debate theory or education policy is presented, which may not represent the personal

view of the author. As a general rule, this text emphasizes the practical rather than the exotic, the likely rather than the unlikely.

All the writing and directing of research assignments for this publication was done by the author. However, Carl Douma, a senior debater at California State University, Sacramento, was invaluable in securing documents, typing, and offering suggestions on potential case arguments. Editing and proofreading assistance was gratefully accepted from Christine Wagner. In addition, a special acknowledgement is due Professor Sugarman of Boalt Hall School of Law who kept my interest in the topic of education and law alive through three years of law school.

The task of compiling the material and finishing the manuscript under rigorous time constraints has been made easier by the patience and understanding of both my family and the staff, students and faculty of the Department of Communication Studies. It is hoped that the material provided in this publication will benefit debaters and coaches, and serve to introduce an exciting topic of vital importance to audiences and judges alike.

David L. Wagner

1 The Problem Area: Elementary And Secondary Education

How Can the United States Elementary and Secondary Education Systems Best Be Improved?

Basic Concepts

Education is an integral part of the American spirit. Perceived as the great equalizer, education is the avenue that leads to success. At another level, education is reflective of the tensions and political pressures that exist in society. The primary goal of education, according to some philosophers, is the development of critical thinking abilities. Over a half million educators in 12 national associations agree, describing the ultimate goal of education as developing "informed, thinking citizens capable of participating in both domestic and world affairs."[1] A more behavioral list of objectives is provided by Dr. Ralph Tyler of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences: "In the United States three functions are expected of education: socialization, social mobility, and individual self-realization. In most of the other countries the public education system is not expected to aid individual self-realization, since it is hard to balance with socialization."[2]

One method for measuring the effectiveness of the American education system is to compare it with programs in other countries. In comparison with other industrialized countries, the average student in the United States takes less math and science. For example, almost all Soviet students complete high school taking 10 years of mathematics and 13 years of science courses.[3] Table 1 demonstrates other enrollment patterns in selected countries of the world.

Table 1

Estimated Total Population and Enrollment, by Level, in Selected Countries of the World: 1975–76

Country	Midyear 1976 Population (in thousands)	School-Year Enrollment, 1975–76			
		All Levels	First Level of Education[1]	Second Level of Education[2]	Third Level of Education[3]
1	2	3	4	5	6
Africa					
Egypt	38,067	6,558,785	[4]4,120,936	[4]1,982,752	[4][5]456,097
Ethiopia	[6]4,750	1,156,668	[4]959,272	[4]190,922	[4]6,474
Nigeria	[6]64,750	5,491,131	[4]4,889,857	[4]568,303	[4]32,971
South Africa	26,129	5,315,223	[4][7]4,653,452	[4][8]563,194	[4][7]98,577
Asia					
India	[7][9]610,007	96,509,414	67,529,903	[10]25,780,961	[10]3,198,550
Indonesia	139,616	23,894,599	[7][11]19,783,270	3,833,129	[11]278,200
Israel	3,465	780,826	[4]535,320	[4][7]170,168	[4]75,338
Japan	112,768	22,526,768	[7][11]10,819,666	[4]9,393,666	[10]2,313,446
Korea, Republic of	[10]35,860	9,233,453	[4]5,514,417	3,393,576	325,460
Pakistan	[10]72,368	7,440,196	[4]5,293,504	[4]2,031,779	[4]114,913
Philippines	43,751	10,958,798	[4]7,639,530	[4]2,554,543	[4]764,725
Saudi Arabia	9,240	935,342	[7][10]686,108	[4]222,797	[4]26,437
Thailand	42,960	8,200,794	6,810,747	1,259,082	[4]130,965
Turkey	40,163	7,177,553	[4]5,337,708	[4]1,516,880	[7][12]322,965
Europe					
Austria	7,514	1,377,341	[10]510,030	770,575	[4]96,736
Belgium	9,889	1,933,274	923,677	849,937	[4]159,660
Czechoslovakia	14,918	2,635,984	1,882,371	328,554	[4]155,059
France	52,915	10,550,295	4,565,994	4,945,725	[4]1,038,576
Germany, Federal Republic of	[10]61,513	11,076,447	[4]6,425,217	[4]3,815,228	[4]836,002
German Democratic Republic	[10]16,786	3,400,086	2,53.,924	481,162	[7][4]366,000
Italy	56,189	10,776,665	4,741,650	5,058,303	[4]976,712
Netherlands	13,770	3,067,091	1,448,084	1,330,981	[4]288,026
Poland	[10]34,362	6,202,631	4,198,667	1,428,465	[7][10]575,499
Romania	21,446	4,275,497	[7][10]3,019,776	[7][4]1,091,154	[7][10]164,567
Spain	35,971	7,332,993	3,624,136	[4]3,188,619	[4]520,238
United Kingdom	55,928	11,505,602	[4]5,811,517	[4]4,990,440	[4]703,645
Yugoslavia	21,560	4,124,914	[4]2,856,463	[4]873,469	[4]394,992
North America					
Canada	23,143	5,942,291	2,484,207	2,639,931	[4]818,153
Cuba	9,464	2,546,233	1,747,738	715,807	[4]82,688
Mexico	62,329	15,909,836	12,148,221	3,241,421	[4]520,194
Panama Canal Zone	[10]44	11,607	5,557	[7][4]4,460	[4]1,590
Puerto Rico	[10]3,213	786,109	475,979	[10]212,613	[4]97,517
United States	215,118	57,447,859	[7][12]25,928,000	[7][12]20,336,000	[4]11,184,359
Virgin Islands (U.S.A.)	[10]96	31,536	[7][12]17,668	[4]11,799	[4]2,069
Oceania					
American Samoa	[10]31	12,494	[4]9,203	[4]2,602	[4]689
Australia	13,643	3,231,089	1,842,101	1,114,250	[4]274,738
Guam	[10]102	32,370	[7][10]16,945	[10]11,625	[4]3,800
New Zealand	3,138	830,232	[10]395,739	[10]359,564	74,929
South America					
Argentina	25,719	5,485,694	[10]3,601,243	1,283,056	801,395
Brazil	109,181	22,284,979	[10]19,286,611	[4]1,681,728	1,316,640
Chile	[4]10,454	2,858,856	2,243,274	465,935	[4]149,647
Colombia	24,372	5,533,951	[4]3,953,242	[7][10]1,394,074	[4]186,635
Peru	[4]16,090	4,100,365	[10]3,019,624	890,106	190,635
Venezuela	12,361	3,127,550	2,203,574	710,434	[4]213,542
U.S.S.R.	256,674	50,137,758	34,333,000	[7][10]10,950,800	[7][10][13]4,853,958

[1] Education at the first level provides basic instruction in the tools of learning (elementary and primary school)
[2] Education at the second level is based upon at least 4 years previous instruction at the first level, and provides general or specialized instruction, or both (middle, secondary, vocational, teacher-training, and high school).
[3] Education at the third level requires as a minimum condition of admission the successful completion of education at the second level, or evidence of the attainment of an equivalent level of knowledge (university, teachers' college, higher professional school).
[4] 1974-75 data.
[5] Estimated.
[6] 1973-74 data.
[7] 1972-73 data.
[8] 1971-72 data.
[9] Includes all education at the second level.
[10] 1969-70 data.
[11] Includes correspondence courses.
[12] Includes data for the Indian-held part of Jammu and Kashmir.

A review of cross-national data on the subject of educational achievement indicates that

> The U.S. educational system has clearly been responsive both to the rapid changes in society and to its basic democratic ideology. It has reached a larger proportion of its young people than almost all other nations, while its top 5% have attained the same high scores reached by nations that attempt to teach only a small fraction of their 18-year-olds. There are still problems to be solved, but the progress is encouraging.[4]

Another standard for measuring effectiveness is the number of literate adults. One of the ongoing problems which require close scrutiny is the high level of functional illiteracy in American adults. A Ford Foundation report indicates that there are 18 to 64 million adult illiterates in the U.S. depending on the definition of illiteracy, and about 15 percent of American adults (23 million) have serious reading problems, with the same number lacking the literacy to function adequately in society.[5] This failure is symptomatic of a deeper problem besetting the educational system. High school students are not being equipped with the basic skills necessary for success in the job market. The astronomically high youth unemployment rate of over 18 percent is evidence of this point. This standard of so-called employability is another measure of the effectiveness of an educational system.

Several movements are under way to remedy these problems. The National Center for Educational Statistics predicts:

> Adult education and occupational education are two areas that are expected to grow in participation in the 1980s. The size of the population beyond compulsory school-age will increase in the decade, enlarging the market for adult education. The 1970s trend toward greater enrollment in occupational education is expected to continue into the decade as the labor market demand for skilled workers continues.[6]

---

[1] "General education" only.
[2] Includes intermediate and pre-university courses.
[3] 1976-77 data.
[4] Excludes teacher training.
[5] Includes part-time pupils.
[6] Excludes alien armed forces, civilians, and diplomats.
[7] Excludes data for the Pakistan-held part of Jammu and Kashmir, and for Junagardh, Manavadar, Gilgit, and Baltistan.
[8] Includes evening Schools.
[9] Includes non formal education.
[10] Includes special education.
[11] Includes relevant data for Berlin for which separate data have not been supplied.
[12] Includes preparatory studies for higher education and extended secondary school and vocational training.
[13] Excludes civilian aliens within the country but includes civilian nationals temporarily outside the country.
[14] Includes evening courses for adults.
[15] Includes part-time and adult pupils.
[16] Includes armed forces stationed in the area.
[17] Public education only.
[18] Includes special and adult education.

SOURCE: United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris, *Statistical Yearbook, 1977.*

FROM: *Digest of Education Statistics*, 1980.

In high schools, vocational education programs provide job-related skills. A preliminary report by the National Institute of Education concluded that "high school students enrolled in vocational education programs are more likely to get jobs in their fields than are students taking general education courses."[7] Despite the availability of such courses, the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education claims that our high schools fail to prepare a third of American students for the world, and the situation cannot be helped unless the traditional approach of public high schools is overhauled. The remedy is to move vocational training "out of the high schools and into community colleges and into workplaces themselves. Basic skills should be emphasized more in high schools, with more federal money given for the purpose and more remedial programs in basic skills for dropouts."[8]

President James Earl Carter proposed an ambitious Youth Education and Employment Initiative which would have channeled money to train students in job-related skills. Richard Graham, a consultant to the Department of Education, describes this proposal:

> The proposed Youth Act of 1980 is intended to make that all possible. It calls for $2 billion in new federal funding, roughly half of it through the Department of Education, to help schools in poverty areas improve basic skills—reading, math, writing, and speaking. These funds are also intended to help improve "employability," the combination of presentability, dependability, knowing how to do something, and willingness to learn more that counts heavily in getting a job and getting ahead.[9]

This plan sought to redress the current funding imbalance which is weighted heavily against such needy students. As noted by the *Congressional Quarterly:*

> The bulk of compensatory education money goes to students in the elementary grades. The federal government spends almost three times as much on poor children in kindergarten and elementary schools as it does on poor children in junior high and high school. And the average low-income student who goes on to college gets 19 times as much federal educational help as the high school graduate who does not.[10]

Opponents objected to numerous provisions in the proposal. The comments of Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) are representative of their views: "The Carter bill would subsidize private schools that don't follow federal law. It is so overburdened with redundant and unworkable governance mechanisms, program criteria, and enforcement threats" that schools "cannot help but ask whether the potential successes are worth the burdens and the

risk."[11] This proposal raised the more basic issue of who will be responsible for elementary and secondary education?

Education Agents

Federal, state, and local agencies all share responsibility for promoting educational services. The usual justifications for government involvement are provided by Drummond and Andrews who note that "the justifications (motives) for increasing governmental authority (political influence) over education have varied: equalization of educational opportunity through the equalization of funding, national defense, civil rights, economic incentives for the construction industry, nutrition and health, improved use of technology, citizen participation, employment of the poor, [and] research and development."[12]

Federal Government

President Ronald Reagan has promised to cut federal education programs and to combine remaining categorical programs into bloc grants. Newspaper reports indicate that:

> Officials expect to allocate the grants according to a state or district's number of disadvantaged or handicapped children—the present formula. However, there would be no further requirement that any of the aid be spent in educating these particular children. One fear voiced by August Steinhilber of the National School Boards Association was that the removal of federal sanctions "strengthens the political forces who want to cut taxes." This is because school districts, to qualify for federal aid under the old system, had to demonstrate that their spending per pupil had not slackened. Now this stricture is gone. "This whole plan virtually invites local governments to spend less on schools attended by the poor or handicapped," said a congressional aide.[13]

Much of the continuing federal effort in education has recently been consolidated. On 7 May 1980 the Department of Education (DOE) became operational. This newest Cabinet-level department was headed by a former judge, Shirley M. Hufstedler. It took several tries before Congress passed the necessary legislation to create this controversial department. The purposes of the DOE are:

1. To insure equal educational opportunities for all citizens.
2. To strengthen the federal commitment to support state and local efforts to meet educational needs.
3. To encourage increased involvement of the public, parents, and students in federal education programs.
4. To promote improvements in the quality of education through research, evaluation, and information sharing.
5. To improve coordination, management, and accountability of federal education programs.[14]

Over 13,000 employees and $14 billion are scattered over seven major program units dealing with various aspects of elementary, secondary, and higher education.

Proponents of this consolidated approach argued that education programs would be able to compete more effectively for funds, achieve efficiency through better coordination, and acquire a centralized focus and identity in a single department.[15] Not all education associations supported the DOE, although the National Education Association (NEA) was a vocal supporter of its formation. Objections to this department included concern that the NEA would have undue influence over policy decisions and that the change would be more an illusion than real reform.[16] At another level, it was feared that:

> The proposed elevation of education to Cabinet level would accelerate the process of bureaucratic takeover of U.S. education which, throughout US history, has been controlled and principally funded by the States and localities. A unified Federal educational bureaucracy would, in the view of such opponents, likely produce domination of education at all levels by the Federal Government.[17]

The DOE in its brief existence has not had a real opportunity to demonstrate its potential. One early test of its power saw Secretary Hufstedler back down on a series of regulations which were vetoed by Congress. Another major set of regulations on bilingual education were recently rescinded by President Reagan. DOE faces an uncertain future.[18] President Reagan campaigned on a promise to abolish the department and early previews of budget reductions indicate a proposed cut of 20 percent and a major reorganization of the education grant structure.[19] Only time and further developments will indicate the ability of the Department of Education to survive.

The courts are also an integral part of the federal role in education.

> It looks like a slow year for the Supreme Court. Where the Court in recent years has decided questions of student discipline, big-city desegregation, and "affirmative action" versus "reverse discrimination," few education-related cases of note are on the docket this year. Most of the school cases that were appealed were rejected when the Court began its fall term in October.[20]

There is a concern that the courts will allow malpractice suits to be brought against teachers and administrators. Dr. Arlene Patterson, a consultant to the Florida Department of Education, notes both the promise and the threat from such legal action:

> Spreading from medicine, the malpractice suit has threatened lawyers, engineers, architects, accountants, and all specialties in the health industry. Now educators have joined the group. It is hard to predict what effect malpractice will have on education, and there

> may be little advantage to guess. As educators we must determine whether educational malpractice distorts the profession and practice of education or presents an opportunity to deliver ourselves from our own bad practices.[21]

State and Local Governments

Ellis Katz, acting director of the Center for the Study of Federalism, declares that "the decade of the 1970s may become known as the era of rediscovered state responsibility for education. While history and tradition have caused most states to leave educational matters to local discretion, various forces are now combining to shift the primary political arena for education to the state level."[22] There are four major reasons for this shift of power to the states:

1. Court decisions, especially in the area of school finance, have caused many states to reconsider fundamental educational policies.
2. A legacy of the federal government's involvement in education has been expanded to state departments of education. During the 1960s, federal mandates and grants encouraged state departments to take a more active role in such areas as educational planning, evaluation, and program development.
3. It has now become clear that the property tax—the cornerstone of local school finance—has become overburdened. Since the federal government has shown little inclination to increase its spending for education, the struggle for more dollars has shifted to the state arena.
4. At the state level itself, education has become more of a political issue. The once monolithic education community has developed internal divisions, and state legislators are besieged by conflicting demands from teacher unions, local school boards, school administrators, community colleges, state universities, and a multitude of other special interest groups.[23]

States have used this new-found freedom to enact school finance reform laws, develop competency-based testing requirements for teachers and students, and legislate curriculum reform. At the same time, local school districts have maintained their position as an important source of education funding, school construction, and program innovations. Many of these factors will be explained in greater detail in later chapters.

Private Schools

Private elementary and secondary schools now comprise more than 18 percent of the nation's elementary and secondary schools, and they enroll 10 percent of all students, according to a preliminary study by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). NCES said

19,668 private elementary and secondary schools enroll 5.078 million of the nation's students.[24] Over 80 percent of these institutions are church-affiliated as demonstrated in Table 2.

Table 2

Enrollment in Nonpublic Elementary and Secondary Schools, [1]by Affiliation of School and by State: Fall 1978

State	Total	Not Church-related	Church-Related		
			Total	Baptist	Catholic
1	2	3	4	5	6
United States	5,077,158	751,006	4,326,152	206,429	3,273,203
Alabama	65,670	29,332	36,338	7,767	15,170
Alaska	3,812	441	3,371	942	697
Arizona	37,902	11,795	26,107	414	17,558
Arkansas	19,687	6,615	13,072	985	7,454
California	484,576	94,051	390,525	22,407	262,680
Colorado	36,331	6,631	29,700	2,616	17,878
Connecticut	90,235	22,184	68,051	300	62,977
Delaware	22,160	3,093	19,067	1,950	14,500
District of Columbia	22,235	4,683	17,552	227	13,026
Florida	204,090	51,897	152,193	28,569	73,895
Georgia	83,832	44,195	39,637	11,921	13,222
Hawaii	34,367	10,157	24,210	1,132	15,301
Idaho	6,106	249	5,857	0	2,345
Illinois	363,522	19,616	343,906	3,493	293,946
Indiana	105,472	7,730	97,742	6,882	68,944
Iowa	61,578	238	61,340	1,649	48,392
Kansas	32,303	2,424	29,879	363	25,419
Kentucky	71,173	7,335	63,838	4,360	53,999
Louisiana	157,482	32,404	125,078	3,551	110,598
Maine	18,063	7,708	10,355	478	7,579
Maryland	110,033	17,923	92,110	3,968	71,042
Massachusetts	142,842	27,933	114,909	82	108,920
Michigan	217,803	10,601	207,202	12,378	135,920
Minnesota	91,275	3,354	87,921	2,282	67,005
Mississippi	51,338	29,756	21,582	3,904	11,354
Missouri	131,546	9,224	122,322	1,772	98,832
Montana	9,258	1,103	8,155	194	5,186
Nebraska	39,869	1,287	38,582	221	30,634
Nevada	6,381	755	5,626	286	4,091
New Hampshire	21,205	6,633	14,572	278	12,180
New Jersey	232,858	20,324	212,534	1,069	197,836
New Mexico	17,175	3,240	13,935	912	9,790
New York	617,009	60,516	556,493	3,608	453,127
North Carolina	60,131	24,098	36,033	14,024	10,251
North Dakota	10,245	345	9,900	0	9,002
Ohio	274,533	14,864	259,669	5,026	234,394
Oklahoma	16,196	2,730	13,466	547	7,571
Oregon	26,586	2,653	23,933	292	14,769
Pennsylvania	425,641	32,769	392,872	5,165	342,382
Rhode Island	29,687	2,534	27,153	70	25,234
South Carolina	52,590	26,662	25,928	10,472	7,844
South Dakota	12,252	2,266	9,986	54	6,997
Tennessee	74,702	16,742	57,960	15,738	16,245
Texas	153,049	21,603	131,446	8,501	81,048
Utah	5,902	1,746	4,156	0	3,057
Vermont	8,512	3,380	5,132	626	3,974
Virginia	73,844	27,300	46,544	8,301	23,350
Washington	56,858	7,594	49,264	2,523	27,368
West Virginia	13,016	1,348	11,668	1,846	8,999
Wisconsin	170,289	6,148	164,141	2,284	117,616
Wyoming	3,937	797	3,140	0	1,605

[1]Includes enrollment in special education, vocational/technical, and alternative schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, preliminary data from the Survey of Nonpublic Schools. 1978-79.

FROM: *Digest of Education Statistics*, 1980

Church-Related					
Calvinist	Episcopal	Jewish	Lutheran	Seventh-Day Adventist	Other
7	8	9	10	11	12
47,501	76,575	102,350	217,835	125,818	6,441
233	1,993	58	1,599	1,669	7,849
0	0	0	49	596	1,087
191	557	296	1,607	1,468	4,016
365	739	0	660	2,050	819
4,124	6,573	4,386	22,889	19,500	47,966
709	172	399	2,968	2,569	2,389
0	1,374	1,371	612	509	908
0	215	111	0	312	1,979
0	2,203	0	0	463	1,633
2,304	9,022	4,330	8,347	3,939	21,788
52	1,145	837	678	3,586	8,196
0	1,207	0	1,204	1,175	4,191
0	0	0	593	1,691	1,228
5,538	185	2,486	30,277	3,550	4,431
895	576	179	9,342	1,726	9,198
3,942	227	46	2,478	2,527	2,079
0	165	184	1,706	1,080	962
0	471	142	250	1,173	3,443
0	4,652	91	1,895	1,615	2,676
0	0	100	0	595	1,603
250	2,528	3,416	2,529	2,736	5,591
252	758	1,490	0	1,942	1,465
18,389	598	1,115	25,880	6,055	6,867
1,468	905	171	10,982	1,968	3,140
0	2,020	0	0	1,429	2,875
96	234	228	11,555	2,409	7,196
314	0	0	450	1,284	727
0	321	25	4,671	1,777	933
0	0	112	212	627	298
0	722	0	0	94	1,298
1,816	395	5,488	978	1,107	3,845
449	0	58	185	1,083	1,458
282	5,029	66,986	11,155	5,423	10,883
0	1,383	86	797	1,939	7,553
0	0	0	543	339	16
50	79	1,973	5,626	3,566	8,955
0	2,201	34	627	1,557	929
0	550	190	653	4,503	3,066
1,046	2,043	2,814	1,502	3,807	34,113
0	402	251	102	0	1,094
0	2,648	147	568	249	4,000
454	62	0	458	772	1,189
0	2,172	414	1,531	6,538	15,322
0	13,644	1,359	8,101	9,617	9,176
0	0	0	304	361	434
58	32	0	0	262	180
215	5,379	314	1,495	1,891	5,599
2,790	994	230	2,213	7,220	5,926
0	0	0	0	323	500
1,219	0	201	37,365	2,084	3,372
0	0	322	199	1,014	0

Despite recent increases in private school enrollments of blacks and Hispanics, almost 90 percent of these students are white, wealthy, and attend school in Northern states.[25]

Problems arise, however, when government attempts to aid or regulate such schools. Fears of an unconstitutional entanglement of church and state prevent all but the most necessary interaction. Since many private schools are not now covered by certain kinds of state and federal mandates, the extension of appropriate regulations or aid to include private and religious schools would fulfill each of the three debate resolutions.

Home Education

A growing phenomenon on the American education scene is the return of home teaching of children. Rust and Reed of the University of California in Los Angeles note that

> Increasingly, parents are withdrawing their children from public schools to educate them in the home. This tendency, now fairly widespread, draws from a number of isolated complaints, each having its own peculiar rationale—complaints springing from religious convictions and beliefs, racial identification and prejudice, dissatisfaction with academic standards, and humanistic education factors.[26]

Estimates of the number of parents who will be educating their children at home by the end of the 1980s range up to half a million families.[27]

The position of the states on this issue is revealed by a recent survey by the New Hamphire State Department of Education which indicated that:

> At least 39 states have a statutory or authorization process for allowing home education, 32 of these giving local school officials the initial responsibility for approving home education. Of the 39 states, 23 insist home education be equivalent to public school education (or substantially so), while 14 require state certification for the home instructor and 26 require "competence" of the instructor without actually defining this term.[28]

The movement for home education is likely to receive support from the upsurge in mediated instruction, computer assisted learning, and instructional programming on radio and television.

Employee Education

Business and industry are an important part of the total education picture. Anthony Schwaller of St. Cloud State University notes with pride that:

> Literally millions of employees have participated in industry's education and training programs. Note, for example, that 610 firms recently surveyed by the Conference Board Record in New York, each with 500 or more employees, among them spent over $2 billion in 1974-75 on employee education and training. Some 3.7 million employees participated in in-house courses taught during work, and 700,000 employees were enrolled in company courses during non-working hours. In fact, it is estimated that, in toto, over $4 billion is spent annually on education and training in the private industrial and business sector across the nation.[29]

These business-initiated programs are no longer restricted to managers and white collar workers. Recognizing that many young workers are deficient in basic reading and writing skills, firms are now willing to invest the time and money necessary to remedy these problems.

The Conference Board estimated that "in 1976 some 30,000 American workers participated in remedial courses during working hours" and that "35 percent of the nation's companies with 10,000 or more employees provided such courses during or after work hours."[30] Prospects for the future appear bright. One very clear trend is toward an increasing use of training in small and medium-sized firms.[31]

Definitions

The debate problem area and each of the specific resolutions contain words and phrases which must be defined. There are several reasons why it is critical to accurately conceptualize terms. Definitions contribute to the general clarity of communicating precise ideas and also help to uncover major issues that are in dispute.[32] In addition, definitions are needed to establish what issues are germane to the affirmative and negative side of each resolution. Attention is focused on important areas to research, and a viable counterplan is provided the negative when terms are clearly delineated.

There are numerous ways of meeting the obligation of providing reasonable definitions. These range from attempts to discern the spirit of the resolution, to dictionary definitions, to the grammatical context of the words and phrases in the resolution. A more appropriate approach is to examine what experts in the field of education consider to be proper definitions of relevant terms.[33]

This year's topic should have fewer definitional problems than other years. *Elementary and secondary education* commonly refers to educa-

tion from kindergarten to twelfth grade. *The federal government* refers to the central government of the United States located in Washington, D.C. If any other potential federal structure were meant, the article would be *a* and not *the*. The term *should* is also important in a debate sense because it forces the debaters to center their attention on what policy ought to be adopted. "There is no burden on the affirmative to demonstrate that this policy 'will' be enacted into law, only that it is 'desirable' to do so."[34]

Some of the resolutions require establishing standards. Currently Webster's Dictionary defines *standards* as applying "to some measure, principle, model, etc., with which things of the same class are compared in order to determine their quantity, value, quality, etc."[35] *Education*, in the literature, "is generally applied to the development of information, concepts, and intellectual abilities."[36] The term *minimum* refers to the "least quantity or amount possible"[37] or "the smallest possible amount or degree"[38] that is acceptable.

Conclusions

A brief glance at any newspaper during recent months reveals the attention focused on elementary and secondary education. Violence in schools, school prayer, competency testing, creationism and the teaching of evolution, elimination of federal grants, and censorship of books are but a few of the issues being discussed. A thorough exploration of the debate resolutions will yield a wealth of information on these and other topics of current interest and concern.

2 Minimum Standards

Resolved: That the Federal Government Should Establish Minimum Competency Standards for Elementary and Secondary Schools in the United States.

Basic Concepts

The responsibility for establishing minimum educational standards is shared by all three levels of government—federal, state, and local. Traditionally, the local school district has exhibited a great degree of freedom in determining the curriculum offered in public elementary and secondary schools. However, as these districts have accepted a larger share of federal and state money, this control has eroded. Not only have these other levels of government become concerned with the curriculum offered in these institutions, but a variey of other educational standards ranging from building codes to bilingual education have been promulgated.

This chapter will explore the debate resolution which, on the basis of preliminary balloting, is likely to be selected as the official topic for 1981–82. The other resolutions on school finance and teacher certification are closely interrelated to issues raised during discussions on setting minimum standards. It is virtually impossible to narrow each resolution sufficiently to exclude concerns of funding or teacher competence.

Federal Role

Congress, federal agencies, and the courts have been responsible for an ever increasing number of educational standards. In one sense this is a necessary by-product of federal funding of certain school programs. President Reagan has promised to significantly reduce the number of such rules and regulations. The most recent example fulfilling this promise was the revocation of proposed regulations on bilingual education.

> The regulations, announced last summer by former Secretary of Education Shirley Hufstedler, would have required school districts with more than 25 non-English or limited English speaking students to offer those students instruction in their native language as well as in English. Alternative programs or other variances from the rules

> were permitted, but would have required a waiver from the Department of Education.[1]

Secretary of Education Terrel Bell has indicated that his department is preparing more flexible guidelines to meet the needs of the "3.6 million school age children who are not proficient in English. Some 70 percent of these children are Spanish speaking."[2]

As with many education regulations, the basis for involvement was predicated upon a federal court decision, in this instance *Lau* v. *Nichols*. Other regulations have stemmed from a series of desegregation cases beginning with *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. In addition, the federal courts have imposed due process requirements on student disciplinary hearings, and, most recently, "a federal judge in Texas . . . ruled that the Dallas school district and the Texas Education Agency could not refuse to educate the illegal aliens and could not charge them tuition."[3] Any of these areas would be appropriate topics for debaters of this resolution.

Another example of the federal impact on education standards is P.L. 94-142 which requires:

> . . . a "free and appropriate public education" for all handicapped children. The provisions of this law cover the handicapped population 3 to 21 years old whose specific impairments necessitate special education and such related services as counseling, physical therapy, and transportation. Placements of handicapped children are to be in the least restrictive environment, that is, wherever and whenever possible, handicapped children are to be placed in classes with nonhandicapped children. Handicapped children are also to participate to the greatest extent possible with nonhandicapped children in nonacademic activities such as recess, lunch, and other school functions.[4]

Table 3 details the number of students covered by this law.

Table 3

Handicapped Population Receiving Special Education and Related Services, as Reported by State Agencies under P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 89-313, by Type of Handicap: School Year 1978–79

Type of Handicap	Number	Percent of 5- to 17-Year-Old Population	Percentage Distribution of Handicapped	P.L. 94-142[1]		P.L. 89-313[2]	
				Number	Percent of 5- to 17-Year-Old Population	Number	Percent of 5- to 17-Year-Old Population
Total	3,934,534	7.86	100.0	3,709,054	7.41	225,480	0.45
Speech impaired	1,214,997	2.42	30.8	1,208,812	2.41	6,185	.01
Learning disabled	1,154,491	2.30	29.3	1,141,202	2.28	13,289	.02
Mentally retarded	916,073	1.83	23.2	801,813	1.60	114,260	.22
Emotionally disturbed	301,358	60	7.6	269,629	.53	31,729	.06
Other health impaired	105,620	21	2.6	101,465	.20	4,155	.00
Orthopedically impaired	70,218	14	1.7	62,375	.12	7,906	.01
Multihandicapped	50,416	10	1.2	40,372	.08	10,044	.02
Deaf	44,481	08	1.1	20,597	.04	23,884	.04
Hard of hearing	41,892	08	1.0	38,300	.07	3,592	.00
Visually handicapped	32,576	06	.8	22,965	.04	9,611	.01
Deaf-blind	2,349	00	.0	1,524	.00	825	.00

[1] Refers to the Education For All Handicapped Children Act and provides formula grants to the States for the provision of free and appropriate education for the handicapped population. 3- to 21-years-old.

[2] Amends Title 1 and provides aid for the handicapped in State owned or operated facilities.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, unpublished tabulations.

From: *The Condition of Education*, 1980.

There are problems associated with potential legal liability for incorrectly mainstreaming such students, and the rapidly rising costs of educating all handicapped children threatens to swamp local budgets. These issues may require additional federal intervention to find appropriate solutions.

State Role

The most impressive trend over the past decade has been the consolidation of power in state departments of education. Most commentators believe that there are several reasons for this including: (1) strengthened state departments of education through federal fund requirements, (2) increased state legislative abdication of education matters, and (3) the need to hold one agency accountable for policy decisions.

As Earl Ogletree, a professor of education at Chicago State University, concludes: "These and other factors suggest that control of the schools will increasingly center in state departments of education, not in local school districts. In turn, the state departments will come under the influence of the federal government through funding of categorical programs and court decisions."[3]

One active area for state standards is in legislating or prescribing curricula. All but Montana have legislated certain subject areas which vary greatly among the states.

> Fewer than half of the states prescribe subjects dealing with the three Rs—reading (40%), writing (30%), grammar (24%), spelling (30%), arithmetic or mathematics (28%). Physical and health education (66% and 58% respectively), alcohol and narcotics (68%), hygiene (40%), safety (36%), and physiology (30%) are given relatively high priority. Twenty-four percent of the states have legislated drug education and tobacco education.[4]

Spurred by decreasing test scores and increased concerns of parents, many states are now legislating so-called back-to-basics curricula. These programs stress such fundamental subjects as reading, writing, and mathematics and are usually accompanied by competency testing to measure acquisition of these skills. "With the addition of Arkansas and Texas, 38 states were active in 1979 in implementing competency-based standards in the public schools."[5] Table 4 provides additional information on these programs.

Table 4

States Using Minimum Competency Testing, by Government Level Setting Standards, Grade Levels Assessed, and Expected Uses of Standards, 1979

States Using Minimum Competency Testing	Government Level Setting Standards	Grade Levels Assessed	Expected[1] Uses of Standards					First Graduating Class Assessed
			Grade Promotion	High School Graduation	Early Exit	Remediation	Other	
Alabama	State	3, 6, 9+		X		X		1981
Arizona	State/local	8, 12		X			X	1976
Arkansas	State	3, 4, 6, 8					X	
California	State/local	4–11, 16 yr. old+	X	X	X	X		1980
Colorado	Local	9, 12		Local option				
Connecticut	State/local	3, 5, 7, 9				X	X	
Delaware	State	11		X				1979
Florida	State/local	3, 5, 8, 11	X	X	X			1983
Georgia	State	4, 8, 10, 11					X	
Idaho	State	9–12		Local option				1982
Illinois	Local	Local option					Local option	
Indiana	Local	3, 6, 8, 10				X	X	
Kansas	State	2–4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12					Local option	
Kentucky	State/local	3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11					X	
Louisiana	State	4, 8, 11					X	
Maine	State	8, 11					X	
Maryland	State	3, 7, 9, 11	X	X		X		
Massachusetts	Local	Local option					X	
Michigan	State	4, 7, 10					Local option	
Missouri	State	8					X	
Nebraska	Local	5+					X	
Nevada	State	3, 6, 9, 12		X		X		
New Hampshire	State	4, 8, 12					Local option	
New Jersey	State	3, 6, 9–12		X		X	X	1985
New Mexico	State	Local option, 10					X	
New York	State	3, 6, 8–12		X		X		1979
North Carolina	State	1–3, 6, 9, 11		X				1980
Oklahoma	None	3, 6, 9, 12					X	
Oregon	Local	Local option		X				1978
Rhode Island	State	4, 8, 10					X	
South Carolina	State	1–3, 6, 8, 11				X	X	
Tennessee	State/local	4–6, 8, 11, 12		X		X	X	1982
Texas	Not reported	3, 5, 9+				X		
Utah	Local	Local option		X				1980
Vermont	State	K–12		X			X	1981
Virginia	State/local	K–6, 9–12		X				1981
Washington	Local	4, 8					Local option	
Wyoming	Local	Local option		X				

[1]In most states uses of standards will be phased in and are not yet in effect.

SOURCE: Education Commission of the States, Department of Research and information, *States Activity—Minimum Competency Testing*, 1980.

From: *The Condition of Education*, 1980.

There are numerous problems cited by critics of the back-to-basics movement. For instance, it is feared that other necessary subjects such as science and foreign languages will be cut from school programs. Other concerns center around the requirement for standardized testing. Opponents note several major issues including: (1) cultural and racial bias in standardized exams, (2) lack of proven validity for these exams, (3) resegregation based on ability tracking within school districts, (4) lack of due process protection in tracking decisions, and (5) discrimination against slow learners.

The ongoing debate on educational testing is an area with which the debater must become familiar since it underlies the ability to measure student performance in basic subjects.

Major Subjects

In addition to the subject areas of reading, writing, and computation, schools offer a variety of instructionally related courses. Table 5 outlines enrollment in junior and senior high schools for certain selected subjects.

Table 5

Number of Students enrolled in Various Subject Areas Compared with Total Enrollment in Grades 7-12 of Public Secondary Schools: United States, 1948-49, 1960-61, and 1972-73

Subject Area	1948-49		1960-61		1972-73	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Total enrollment, grades 7-12	6,907,833	100.0	11,732,742	100.0	18,577,234	100.0
English language arts	7,098,770	102.8	12,972,236	110.6	24,079,059	129.6
Health and physical education[1]	7,794,671	112.8	12,081,639	103.0	21,517,330	115.8
Social Sciences	6,981,980	101.1	11,802,499	100.6	18,898,794	101.7
Mathematics	4,457,987	64.5	8,596,396	73.3	13,240,326	71.3
Natural sciences	4,031,044	58.4	7,739,877	66.0	12,475,429	67.2
Music	2,484,201	36.0	4,954,347	42.2	6,111,223	32.9
Business education	3,186,207	46.1	4,667,570	39.8	6,376,633	34.3
Industrial arts	1,762,242	25.5	3,361,699	28.7	5,726,138	30.8
Home economics	1,693,825	24.5	2,915,997	24.9	4,651,535	25.0
Foreign languages	1,234,544	18.9	2,576,354	22.0	4,510,947	24.3
Art	1,219,693	17.7	2,387,703	20.3	5,115,981	27.5
Agriculture	373,395	5.4	507,492	4.3	374,622	2.0
Vocational trade and industrial education	369,794	5.4	344,704	2.9	484,484	2.6
Distributive education	(2)	(2)	38,363	.3	129,549	.7
Other	111,053	1.6	[illegible]	.9	[illegible]9,126	(4)

[1]Includes driver education and ROTC.
[2]Data not reported separately.
[3]Includes bilingual education only.
[4]Less than 0.05 percent.

NOTE.-Percentages may exceed 100.0 because a pupil may be enrolled in more than one course within a subject area during the school year.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare National Center for Education Statistics, *Summary of Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, 1972-73.*

From: *Digest of Education Statistics*, 1980

While much early debate research will center on basic subjects and standardized testing, the topic is much broader in scope than these narrow areas. Numerous other subjects can legitimately claim to require minimum standards legislation.

Computer Literacy

Just as reading and writing were the essential standards for defining literacy during the past one hundred years, knowledge of the use of computers could well become the *sine qua non* for literacy in the 1990s. Executives in the computer industry estimate that there will be a minicomputer in every home by the year 2000.[8] Even today, according to Ruth Walker of the *Christian Science Monitor,* "virtually every school system has some sort of computerization for administration purposes, whether its own system or a time-sharing arrangement. And it is estimated that about half of all high schools have terminals available to at least some students."[9] The Human Resources Research Organization has cataloged several uses of computers in the education system including:

(1) computing opportunities—providing facilities for each school;
(2) computer literacy—learning what "computer" means;
(3) curriculum enhancement—attaining new objectives;
(4) educational reform, e.g., high school education at home;
(5) cost effectiveness of using computer instruction.[10]

This debate resolution on minimum standards serves to focus attention on the curricular issues of computer education.

A survey by the Minnesota Educational Computing Consortium discovered "at least 2,668 high school and junior high courses around the country could be described as teaching computer literacy."[11] The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics recommends that such courses be available in elementary school and that course work combine the following elements:

> Problem-solving skills used in writing algorithms (calculations) or computer programs.
> Knowledge of how computers can be used in business, medicine, government, science, and other fields.
> Some familiarity with the parts of computer hardware, software, and systems.
> Awareness of career opportunities involving computers.
> Awareness of the effect of the computer on society: the issues of privacy, computer crime, automation, the loss of jobs, and the like.[12]

In addition to providing a basic survival skill, computer literacy also sharpens a student's reasoning and problem-solving abilities. Another

advantage is that use of home terminals as a supplement to in-class teaching will provide increased opportunity for handicapped and adult learners to have the benefits of a full education.

Despite these benefits, computer hardware and software remain expensive items. Some school administrators and teachers remain apprehensive about the role that this new technology will play in the next decade. Robert Seidel, the director of the Human Resources Research Organization, elaborates:

> Clearly, interest in the potential value of computers as an aid to education continues to rise, but ambiguities and confusion as to "where the computer is" in terms of its instructional role keep us from making full and confident use of it. We are still unsure of how successful computers are. We need a consistent framework for evaluating the use of computers for instruction.[13]

There is also a question of which level of government will provide this framework. "Federal funding from the U.S. Office of Education and the National Science Foundation, for both equipment and programming, totaled $230 million between 1965 and 1975. In 1977 a Congressional Science and Technology subcommittee reviewed the role of computers in education and recommended continued federal leadership in this area."[14] Others doubt the viability of the federal commitment. For instance, Ruth Walker envisions the costs being borne "largely by local school districts, with help from the state and, in some cases, from the computer industry."[15] This lack of federal support will exacerbate social inequality. Steve Hallmark, a consultant to the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, suggests that "computerization of education ultimately will lead to a dual system: Underfunded public schools, lacking up-to-date machines, will exist for the poor, while a 'spectacular' privately funded system will be accessible to the well-to-do."[16]

Foreign Languages

In October 1979, the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies delivered its official report to the President. For those who were familiar with the problems facing the study of foreign languages in elementary and secondary schools the statistics accumulated by the Commission came as no surprise:

> Only 8 percent of American universities now require a foreign language for admission, compared with 34 percent in 1966. Only 15 percent of high school students now study a foreign language, down from 24 percent in 1965. Only one out of 20 public high school students studies French, German or Russian beyond the second year. Four years is considered a minimum for achieving usable language competence.[17]

A *New York Times* report earlier that year indicated similar patterns. While 15% of all high school students took a modern language, only 2% ever reached the important third year of study.[18] This low enrollment occurred despite the fact that a University of Michigan Research Center study showed that almost half of those surveyed wished to speak a foreign language. Other interesting findings included:

> Ninety percent believed foreign language instruction should be available in secondary school, and half feel it should be required. Nearly three-quarters believe that foreign languages should be offered in elementary schools and 40 percent say they should be required. More than 80 percent of parents with children under 16 said they are encouraging their children to study another language.[19]

Table 6 demonstrates the distribution of students among modern foreign languages.

Table 6

Enrollment in Foreign Languages Compared with Total Enrollment in Grades 9–12 of Public Secondary Schools: United States, Fall 1965 to Fall 1976

[Numbers in thousands]

Language	Fall 1965	Fall 1968	Fall 1970	Fall 1974	Fall 1976	Percent Change, 1965 to 1970	Percent Change, 1970 to 1976
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Total enrollment, grades 9–12	11,610	12,718	13,332	14,132	14,310	14.8	7.3
All foreign languages[1]							
Number	3,559	3,891	3,780	3,295	3,174	3.3	−16.0
Percent	31.5	30.6	28.3	23.3	22.2	. . .	. . .
Modern foreign languages							
Number	3,068	3,518	3,514	3,127	3,023	14.6	−14.0
Percent	26.4	27.7	26.4	22.1	21.1	. . .	. . .
Spanish							
Number	1,427	1,698	1,811	1,678	1,717	26.9	−5.2
Percent	12.3	13.4	13.6	11.9	12.0	. . .	. . .
French							
Number	1,251	1,328	1,231	978	888	−1.7	−27.8
Percent	10.8	10.4	9.2	6.9	6.2	. . .	. . .
German							
Number	328	423	410	393	353	25.1	−14.1
Percent	2.8	3.3	3.1	2.8	2.5	. . .	. . .
Russian							
Number	27	24	20	15	11	−24.5	−44.2
Percent	.2	.2	.2	.1	.1	. . .	. . .
Italian							
Number	25	27	27	40	46	8.3	66.9
Percent	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	. . .	. . .
Other modern foreign languages							
Number	9	18	15	23	9	56.5	−41.1
Percent	.1	.1	.1	.2	.1	. . .	. . .
Latin							
Number	591	372	265	167	150	−55.1	−43.3
Percent	5.1	2.9	2.0	1.2	1.1	. . .	. . .

[1] Includes enrollment in ancient Greek (not shown separately). Fewer than 1,000 students were enrolled in this language in each of the years shown.

Note: Beause of rounding, details may not add to totals. Percentages were computed from unrounded data.

Sources: (1) U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Center for Education Statistics, *Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools;* (2) Modern Language Association of America, *Foreign Language Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools,* Fall 1970 and Fall 1974; and (3) American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Inc., unpublished data.

From: *Digest of Education Statistics,* 1980.

This gap between what the public says it encourages and the reality of language study is produced by several factors. In an era of "back to basics," foreign languages are seen as frills which are unnecessary for essential education. Also, language labs and training are expensive items which are easily axed when budget cuts are required. In addition, many parents were bored or frustrated by studying foreign languages when they were in school. The result, according to S. Frederick Starr of the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies,

was that they gave up after a few years. "Quitting after a year or two, their experience is marked by understandable bitterness and frustration. Later, when such students find themselves on local school boards, they act upon the basis of this unsuccessful learning experience, to the detriment of foreign language programs."[20] Foreign language curriculum thus lacks a strong constituency.

Serious deterioration of the American commitment to foreign languages will have severe repercussions. Long-term damage to overseas business opportunities and the balance of trade are foreseen. The lack of understanding of other cultures has grave implications to national security and diplomacy. As the President's Commission noted:

> Nothing less is at issue than the nation's security. At a time when the resurgent forces of nationalism and of ethnic and linguistic consciousness so directly affect global realities, the United States requires far more reliable capacities to communicate with its allies, analyze the behavior of potential adversaries, and earn the trust and sympathies of the uncommitted. [21]

One of the major questions revolves around which level of government should correct this language imbalance. Steven Grant, who headed a task force on modern languages, while conceding that there is no comprehensive or uniform policy on languages still concludes:

> It is the state and local governments that have the right to set language policy and that will do so. The Federal Government should set down some very broad guidelines in specific areas involving language; it may also state its own language policy. But in a federal system like ours, the small communities are always the final arbiters of taste and culture.[22]

There has been encouraging action on the part of several local school systems. Cincinnati and Chicago both have adopted creative language programs in recent years which have met with critical acclaim.[23] Of course, there also exists a rationale for federal involvement. The Rand Corporation study (submitted to the President's Commission) reviewed the relevant literature and provided seven possible national objectives: "national security, economic strength, international competence, healthy democratic processes, efficient training of specialists, efficient use of specialists, and promotion of basic research."[24] Bills have been introduced in Congress by representatives such as Paul Simon and Leon Panetta to begin the process of providing incentives to reverse the downward trend in foreign language studies.

While there is general agreement that something must be done, there is no consensus as to what must be done first. As a matter of fact, the

total number of recommendations from recent language task forces and commissions exceeds 200.[25] Proposals include more study of the problem, development of special schools and centers, better measuring instruments, investigation of better teaching methods and curriculum, better teacher training, and grants to schools that establish language programs. One precondition to meaningful reform is the setting of a proficiency standard as a goal to measuring student performance. "The movement to establish a national language proficiency standard also is gaining momentum. A language task force sponsored by the Modern Language Association assembled language specialists from all over the nation in 1978 to focus on this need. One starting point is the 'testing kit' of the Foreign Service Institute. . . ."[26]

There is a price attached to meaningful changes in the study of foreign languages. As an example, the price tag for the President's Commission's 65 recommendations was placed at $245 million for the first year of operation.[27] Many of the problems associated with the decline of the study of other languages are interrelated and require a comprehensive set of reforms. Adoption of narrow, one-shot solutions may not be sufficient to meaningfully reverse current trends. For example, dramatic increases in the number of students enrolled in language courses would occur if this were a graduation requirement. Yet, the 1960s experiences of American colleges would indicate the futility of such a so-called contact-hours approach. Richard Brod of the Modern Language Association concludes:

> We have no evidence that quality of language instruction, or the levels of competence achieved by students were higher in 1966, when 89 percent of the colleges had requirements, than they are today. Indeed there is reason to think that the revolt against them that began in 1968 was fueled by a widespread realization that requirements guaranteed nothing except bodies in the classroom for a fixed period of time.[28]

What is needed, according to former Department of Education Secretary Hufstedler, "is a conscious effort to overhaul our [language] educational experience: to take a fresh look at existing curricular offerings, at textbooks, at syllabi, at the quality of language teaching, and indeed, at the capacities of teachers."[29]

Mathematics

Similar to the problems experienced with the science curriculum, mathematics skills are also declining. While this may seem surprising given the "back-to-basics" emphasis of recent years, in reality the basic education movement may be compounding the problem in math.

The trouble is not with the mechanics of computation, rather it is in the application of math techniques to problem solving. Recent data released by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) indicate that the mathematical ability among high school seniors dropped four percentage points from 1973 to 1978. This decline was due almost entirely to the students' inability to solve math problems. Thomas Carpenter, a University of Wisconsin professor of curriculum and instruction, notes that: "Students are often taught rules for dealing with problems. If they forget the rule they are often unable to solve the problem on their own.[10]

The NAEP provided several reasons for this reduction in skill levels:

> A number of factors were seen as contributing to these declines. The emphasis on back-to-basics, for example, has often resulted in narrowing the curriculum, with more attention focused on computational skills and knowledge of facts and definitions and less time spent on problem solving. Furthermore, textbooks that came into wide use in the 1970s have adopted a simplified approach to problem solving. Problems are often presented in a form that uses few words (e.g.: "52 marbles. 17 taken away. How many are left?"). Often, all addition word problems are presented in the addition section of a textbook, all subtraction and word problems in the subtraction section, etc., and so that students do not gain experience in determining which operation is appropriate to a given situation.[11]

Students are not enrolling in advanced math courses which teach important skills in problem solving. Existing courses are often "simplified" to meet the expectations of slower learners.

Curricular solutions to these problems would include the following:

> An expanded definition of what is "basic" in mathematics is crucial to foster students' ability to cope with different types of mathematical problems. Students must be introduced to exercises involving higher-level as well as lower-level cognitive processes. Textbooks should be modified to include a greater variety of problem-solving tasks. If material is not included in textbooks, teachers may be less likely to introduce it. It would be better to include extra material that might not be used than to reduce the material included to the minimum. Teaching of problem solving should receive more emphasis in the schools. It appears that many teachers feel outside pressure to drill for mastery of skills and not to teach problem solving.[12]

Science

America faces a new gap in scientific literacy. It is not quite the same issue that triggered national concern in the years following the launch of Sputnik and led to massive increases in aid for math and science instruction. Rather, the concern is with the need to produce citizens and

consumers who are equipped with rudimentary knowledge of important issues such as energy, the ecology, health and safety, and the impact of advancing technology. Statistics compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics provide a profile of science enrollment at the secondary level.

> The vast majority of the nation's school districts required at least 1 year of science and mathematics courses at the secondary level, and one-third required more than 1 year of each of these subjects in 1977. Science courses most likely offered in grades 10 through 12 were general science, biology, chemistry, and physics. Enrollments were highest in these courses, with the exception of physics. In 1977, nearly 3 million students in grades 10 through 12 were enrolled in a first-year biology course, 2.2 million in general science, 1.2 million in first-year chemistry, and 0.5 million in first-year physics. Approximately 2.5 million students in these grades were enrolled in some other science course, including 494,235 students taking an advanced course in biology, chemistry, or physics.[33]

Table 7 shows the distribution among various science courses and math courses offered in grades 7–12.

Table 7

Science and Mathematics Course Offerings and Enrollments in Public Schools, by Grade Level, 1977

Courses	Percent of Schools Offering Course		Enrollment	
	All Schools with Grades 7–9[1]	All Schools with Grades 10–12	All Schools with Grades 7–9	All Schools with Grades 10–12
Science courses				
General sciences	78	60	7,168,270	2,191,355
Earth science	28	37	1,353,392	684,856
Life science	22	18	1,266,472	295,164
Physical science	23	40	1,327,121	688,838
Biology I	30	95	1,648,355	2,953,466
Biology II	10	47	179,204	303,717
Zoology	0	3	8,243	58,943
Physiology	1	5	15,540	50,529
Ecology	2	16	82,855	169,691
Chemistry I	23	89	568,989	1,196,140
Chemistry II	3	23	32,279	136,954
Physics I	22	78	279,204	511,611
Physics II	1	5	8,256	53,564
Astronomy	2	6	14,147	46,375
Mathematics courses				
General math	98	88	9,833,060	3,065,956
Business math	17	52	328,168	572,864
Elementary algebra	54	88	2,402,266	2,028,693
Advanced algebra	27	87	669,440	1,194,279
Any algebra[2]	56	97	3,568,561	3,713,196
Geometry	33	97	1,087,768	1,814,528
Any geometry[3]	33	97	1,091,575	1,833,453
Trigonometry	14	54	168,363	459,541
Probability, statistics	3	7	32,863	39,700
Computer math	7	25	123,157	152,525
Advanced senior math	16	56	139,750	225,407
Calculus	7	31	52,337	105,349

[1]Categories are not discrete. Schools with grades 7–9 include those with one or more of the grades 7–9 and one or more of the higher grades. Schools with grades 10–12 include those with one or more of the grades 10–12 and one or more of the lower grades.
[2]Includes elementary algebra, advanced algebra, and courses with equivalent or similar names.
[3]Includes geometry and courses with equivalent or similar names.

SOURCE: Weiss, Iris R. Research Triangle Institute, *Report of the 1977 National Survey of Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies Education*, prepared for the National Science Foundation, 1978.

From: *The Condition of Education*, 1980.

While these numbers sound impressive, they represent only a small percentage of all high school students. "Studies by the National Science Foundation have shown that only 9% of American high school graduates have had one year of physics, 16% one year of chemistry, 45% one year of biology, and 7% one year of general science."[34] At the elementary level, of four important subjects—reading, math, social science, and science—"the least amount of time was spent on science, an overall average of 20 minutes a day. Other results of these studies demonstrate that the environment for teaching these courses is poor. Labs are of poor quality or are nonexistent, science courses nationwide are too limited, use too few different textbooks, and are taught by far too few qualified teachers."[35] In addition, a National Science Foundation survey discovered that "only 4 percent of classes in elementary school science are taught in

special science rooms and that more than a third of the instruction is done with no special science equipment. Likewise, in the junior and senior high schools, lecturing and reading from a single textbook remain the dominant method of teaching."[36]

There are several reasons for this decline in the level of instruction. First, the back-to-basics movement has reduced the amount of time available for other courses such as science. Second, now that the cold-war concern for technological superiority has waned and with an increased suspicion of science on the part of many, "federal educational priorities have shifted from science to new issues such as vocational education, remedial programs, and the rights of handicapped students. The budgets of local school boards have followed a similar pattern."[37] Third, students' attitudes shift away from enjoyment and respect for science as they grow older. The National Assessment of Educational Progress surveyed youth at ages 9, 13, and 17 and found that "70 percent of the youngest group but only half of the older groups enjoy science. Sixty percent of the 17-year-olds said that science and technology have caused at least some of the nation's problems."[38] Finally, the prospect of renewed federal involvement is low. There is a widespread belief at the local level that "Washington should not be in the business of competing with private publishers or determining what is taught in American classrooms."[39]

Although the U.S. still has an ample supply of scientific and technologically oriented students completing college who can compete with the Soviet Union, Japan, and Western Europe, the rest of the populace are becoming scientific illiterates. A recent report from the Department of Education and the National Science Foundation concluded: "The current trend toward virtual scientific and technological illiteracy, unless reversed, means that important national decisions involving science and technology will be made increasingly on the basis of ignorance and misunderstanding."[40] There are other problems involved with the decline of science as an academic subject. Women and minorities have been traditionally underrepresented in jobs requiring scientific expertise. It may be more difficult to recruit these individuals into professional programs if courses at the secondary level continue to decline in quality and number. Finally, the technological base of our industrial society could face long-term damage. As the National Center for Education Statistics notes:

> Our Nation's continued advancement in technology is dependent to a large extent upon its supply of science and engineering personnel. The persons who make up this manpower base conduct basic research to advance the understanding of nature, perform applied research and development in a variety of areas such as health,

> energy, and the environment, and train the Nation's future scientists and engineers."

The solutions to this problem require a comprehensive approach. Suggestions range from more innovative teaching methods and textbooks to developing more stringent standards for science courses. It is also believed that more science courses for non-science majors would increase the general level of science knowledge. Finally, "most science educators tend to believe that the basic problem is attitudinal and that the key to better science understanding by the average citizen is a more general acceptance that science is a 'basic.' "[42]

Safety

Instruction in safety is justified as a curricular need in elementary and secondary schools on two levels. Standards are necessary because the school environment itself poses safety problems. For example, chemicals used in science labs are sometimes mislabeled or improperly stored. Another example involves safe use of school buses. Over half of all children attending school are transported by bus. Yet, few schools have formal bus safety programs as a part of the curriculum. "The logical place for kids to learn about bus safety, then, is in the classroom, where teachers can explain the rationale behind bus safety rules. Young students seem to sense that things taught in the classroom are things they ought to know."[43] A recommended program for most elementary students would include an hour of safety instruction a month, dealing with those problems that most frequently lead to injury. "According to the National Safety Council, most deaths involving school buses occur while students are leaving or boarding buses, not while they're riding. Also, nearly half of these students are killed by the buses themselves. Thus the safety mistakes children make *outside* the bus are more costly than those made *on* the bus."[44]

The final example of a school environment safety issue involves participation in school athletic activities. A 1979 Health, Education, and Welfare Department report on *Athletic Injuries and Deaths in Secondary Schools and Colleges* shows that "one million students are injured playing sports each year; of these, an estimated 325,000 injuries—or 2[illegible] for every 100 participants—result from playing football. The report also spells out the injury rate for other sports. Each year, 68 of every 1,000 participants in contact sports other than football are injured; 36 of 1,000 are injured annually in noncontact sports."[45] Data from this report also show the following injury total: "The figures (rounded) for public secondary schools include 210,000 injuries to boys and 40,000 to girls in athletic competition; 218,000 to boys and 43,000 to girls in athletic practice; 17,000 to boys and 10,000 to

girls in intramural sports; and 131,000 injuries to boys and 86,000 to girls in physical education classes."[46] Proposed solutions to this problem are contained in a *Statement of Basic Beliefs* by the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation and include:

> Comprehensive K-12 health curricula; individualized graduation requirements that include physical education credits; training for teachers and coaches who work with disadvantaged, handicapped, or non-English-speaking students; complete elimination of elementary and secondary school boxing programs; no interscholastic competitions below grade 9; and adoption of playing seasons of reasonable length, preceded by an adequate period of conditioning and instruction in fundamentals.[47]

General Traffic Safety

While the school environment itself leads to safety problems which education standards can ameliorate, the school can also become the focal point of a more general safety education effort. Some states have recently introduced a requirement for further safety courses in high schools. Jane E. Berthold, a curriculum developer with Doron Precision Systems, Inc., a firm involved in traffic safety education programs, believes that:

> to be effective, formal traffic safety education must begin at the onset of a child's school career. But it is crucial that this basic instruction be reinforced and expanded as children enter school. At that time, children are given more freedom. They spend a large part of their time in unfamiliar areas where they encounter new conditions and new experiences daily.[48]

At a more basic level, a variety of safety issues must be integrated into both elementary and secondary classrooms:

> Advocates of safety education have long worked for the integration of its principles and concepts into the curriculum throughout grades K-12, with at least a semester program in driver education. Children are profoundly affected by their home and societal environments. If we expect to have a positive effect on their attitudes about cars and driving, we had better not wait until they are 16 years old and then try to inject safe driving habits into them with a 30 hour classroom and six hour lab.[49]

There is a natural progression involved from teaching home or pedestrian safety to major vehicle safety concerns. Yet most schools provide no program for younger students. Jane Berthold concludes:

> All too often, however, schools offer little or no organized training in traffic safety at this point in a child's life. In many school

> systems, a child's first exposure to a course in traffic survival does not come until high school driver education. By that time, a youngster's basic safety attitudes and patterns of behavior are already formed. It is unrealistic to expect to break unsafe habits, which have been forged over a 16-year period, in a one semester driver education course.[50]

Such comprehensive traffic safety programs are necessary if society is serious about reducing the tragic toll of young lives lost in traffic accidents. "Traffic accidents are a leading cause of death and injury among American children 14 years of age and younger. Each year, between four and five thousand children in that age group are killed in traffic, and an additional quarter-million are injured."[51]

Vehicle Safety Programs

One of the most traditional safety courses taught in secondary schools is driver education. Many states have provisions for instituting such courses at the junior and senior high school levels. There are several problems with these programs. First, there is a paucity of rigorous empirical data to support claims that such programs reduce accidents. While some researchers report that a quality high school driver education program can reduce crash involvement by up to 15 percent, no one is quite sure exactly what constitutes a "quality" program.[52] One counterclaim lodged against such programs is that they actually encourage inexperienced students to begin to drive. Some support for this is found in a study of the effects of eliminating funds for driver education classes in Connecticut in 1976, which found that "driving by 16- and 17-year-olds declined 57 percent in communities which dropped the course—and that the number of accidents declined 63 percent. No change was reported for communities that kept the course."[53]

Another problem stems from the fact that such programs are often required for young drivers to receive a license and are mandatory parts of the curriculum. Dr. Seals of Florida State University notes the problem with this mass production approach:

> If there is a desirable type of driver education law . . . it is legislation which merely authorizes school systems to provide driver education courses and provides financial incentives designed to encourage school systems to improve the cost-effectiveness of the subject. . . . In order for the driver education movement to . . . achieve maximum effectiveness, professional and promotional efforts should be aimed at [achieving and] maintaining high standards of quality instead of attaining meaningless quantitative accomplishments.[54]

Also, as a special program these courses may be among the first to be cut when budget problems surface. As Paul Sondel, research director of the Automobile Owners Action Council, notes:

> Administrators have been told that they "must" include this course as a state requirement. They don't like to be told that sort of thing. "Special funding" has been provided in most states, indicating that, for some reason, the costs of driver education were not a legitimate part of the school's curriculum and the course could only be taught when "extra" money was provided."

Many states are also moving toward requiring courses in motorcycle or moped safety. The Motorcycle Safety Foundation has developed appropriate instructional material and "today, separate motorcycle curricula have been written in more than 25 states. Sixteen states have special teacher certification requirements for those wanting to teach how to ride motorcycles. Some 560 high school programs in safe motorcycle riding are being offered in 41 states. Twenty-two colleges and universities are preparing teachers for this field."[56] Such programs face many of the same problems as do driver education courses, although a training program in San Jose, California, has compiled an impressive record of success:

> Analysis of the results indicated that the students had significantly fewer accidents, injuries, and moving violations after the course than before. While collectively the students experienced 48 reportable on-road accidents before the course, only one student had an accident in the period after the course. This was found to be less than both the national rate and the California rate for motorcycle accidents."

Health

Elementary and secondary schools have become increasingly involved in both health education and in the screening and delivery of health services. Either area is important enough to become a candidate for minimum standards legislation, especially given the debater's penchant for developing cases that save lives and prevent injuries.

Health Education

Over half of the states require at least one course in health or hygiene. The School Health Curriculum Project (SHCP), initiated more than ten years ago, provides an integrated approach to improving the effectiveness of the health curriculum. "Preliminary survey data indicate that the SHCP is being used by over 4,000 teachers in nearly 1,000 schools in 34 states in this country. Because this curriculum is substan-

tially standardized and well diffused, it provides a concrete and defined health education intervention with an intrinsic capacity to be analyzed and evaluated."[58] Despite the availability of such material, Marvin Lavenhar, a professor at the New Jersey Medical School, argues: "There is little consensus among educators on what, when, or how health education should be taught. There is also little concrete evidence of its effectiveness. Clearly, more evaluative research is needed to assess the efficacy of old and new approaches to health education."[59]

The school is seen as a logical place for disseminating information on the need for various health practices. An example is provided in the new concern expressed for teaching young students about the risk of heart disease. "Heart and blood vessel diseases kill more Americans every year than all other causes of death combined. Furthermore, atherosclerosis is directly involved in 87 percent of deaths from cardiovascular disease. During 1976, cardiovascular disease claimed nearly 995,000 lives. Cancer ran a distant second in mortality, taking 375,000 victims."[60] Joyce Way of SUNY at Cortland notes the consensus provided in a thorough review of the literature which indicates that:

> The medical profession is becoming very concerned about the increasing evidence of heart disease risk factors present in young adults and children. There is general agreement in the medical profession that a more effective way to prevent coronary heart disease in later life is to concentrate on known preventive measures early in life before coronary heart disease becomes established.[61]

The school remains the most appropriate site for delivery of this message. As Iammarino and Weinberg concluded:

> While heart health education for youth can occur in a variety of settings such as through social, church, and civic groups, none equal the potential afforded us by the schools. The majority of adolescents attend schools; they are a captive audience, and can be assured a quality program that delivers an organized body of current information. The challenge which remains is not simply to transmit effectively such information, but to activate within these students the application of this knowledge both now and in the future.[62]

Another example is provided by Ellen Cohen, adjunct assistant professor of science education at New York University:

> In the United States, 250,000 babies are born each year with serious birth defects; however, there are a number of health behaviors that can increase the odds of conceiving a healthy child. It has been estimated that as much as 70% of birth defects are the result of en-

> vironmental or environmen al and genetic factors. Future parents should familiarize themselves with those health practices that can optimize the outcome of pregnancy, and educators can play a key role in transmitting such knowledge to the public. . . . More recently, educators have begun to recognize that the public school system is an ideal setting in which to introduce the topic of birth defects prevention.[43]

A common problem shared by both the heart disease and birth defects prevention programs is a lack of curriculum and experimental results demonstrating efficacy of this kind of instructional intervention.

Nutrition Education

Nutrition is one of the most important factors influencing a person's health and well-being. Mangham and Vickey of the School of Home Economics at the University of Alabama note the importance of nutrition information:

> The impact on physical and mental development continues to be corroborated through research. Society itself depends upon healthy, well-nourished individuals to fulfill its demands—to produce materials and perform essential services. Despite adequate supplies of food and sufficient financial resources, it is unfortunate that an uninformed public is likely to develop patterns of eating that preclude optimum health.[44]

Although such information could be conveyed in many settings, classroom instruction has proven most effective. Support for such programs is provided by the . . .

> National School Lunch Act and Child Nutrition Amendment (P.L. 95-166). This legislation authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a program of nutrition information and education by allocating funds of 50 cents per child in the 1978-79 fiscal year and 58.9 cents in 1980 to each State Office of Education. Thus, the demand for nutrition education in the school is increasing along with the public awareness that nutrition does influence the total health and well-being of the individual. Schools are reviewing and enlarging nutrition in the total curriculum.[45]

The active promotion of such information is needed at the elementary school level. As Dr. Frankle summarized:

> All evidence seems to indicate that children cannot be expected to instinctively select a diet which meets their nutritional needs. Most educators have found that children's habits are most easily influenced in the early years. Thus, nutrition education must begin early in life and continue through the life cycle. Systematic, sequential programs in schools are essential and each new generation must be taught. It is well worth the time, effort and cost involved.[46]

Sex Education

Listed under a variety of course titles including "family life" and "family living," the topic of sex education is taught in many school districts. "Thirty states and the District of Columbia have specific policies concerning family life and sex education in the public schools and how such instruction is to be implemented. Although no states prohibit sex education (Louisiana, the last state to do so, repealed its law in 1979), only three states and the District of Columbia require such instruction."[67] Most states leave the decision on offering such courses to the discretion of local districts. A surprisingly large number of students have had such a course. Melvin Zelnick notes the empirical data:

> Seven in 10 never-married U.S. women aged 15-19 have had a sex education course, almost all of them in school. Young black women are slightly more likely than whites to have had such a course. About half of all never-married teenagers have had courses which included some teaching about modern contraceptive methods, six in ten have had some formal instruction about VD, and seven in ten have had courses that included detailed instruction about the monthly menstrual cycle.[68]

The social cost engendered by the lack of such information is great. Sociology Professor R. G. Amonker supplies the statistics on teen pregnancies:

> Each year 1.1 million teenagers aged 15–19 beome pregnant, one-tenth of all women in this age group. Teenagers had a total of 378,500 abortions performed in 1976, approximately one-third of all U.S. abortions that year. About 600,000 teenagers gave birth each year. . . . Teenage pregnancy and childbearing also pose serious health, social and economic consequences for mothers and their children. In addition to facing higher health risks, such as death, injury and illness for themselves and their children, teenage mothers are often forced to drop out of school, forego economic advancement and career opportunities, face social disapproval, encounter financial hardships and are more likely to have unstable marriages.[69]

Many experts agree that this problem of teen pregnancies is caused by a lack of accurate information about human sexuality and contraception.

The rapidly increasing number of such pregnancies in an era of increasing courses on sex education would seem to imply that such courses are not particularly effective. A study conducted by Zelnick showed that many teenage women who had a class in sex education still were inaccurate in their assessment of basic aspects of sexuality. What is lacking, claim proponents of such courses, is a comprehensive program. Yet only 10 percent of all schools offer such an integrated

course. Such an intensive approach is needed because it is extremely difficult to change the social and sexual behaviors of students. Douglas Kirby of the Social Science Group notes two reasons for this:

> First, students receive an enormous amount of information about sexuality from their peers, their parents, television, magazines and other sources. Second, the sexual behaviors of students are also strongly influenced by their own emotional, social and sexual needs. Thus, it may be unrealistic to expect young teenagers who take a brief unit or even one full course in sexuality to suddenly overcome 15 or so years of sex-role double standards, sexual images in the media and guilt over sexuality and become more sexually responsible.[70]

Health Services

In addition to offering courses in health and health-related subjects, there exist standards requiring certain health practices. For example:

> Forty-eight of the 50 states now require immunization of children entering school but these requirements have not been uniformly enforced throughout the country. In some localities the responsibility for ensuring that children are vaccinated has been left entirely up to parents. Many parents today don't seem to know or have forgotten about the serious and permanent health problems that can result from measles, polio, rubella, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. Complications range from paralysis, blindness, and deafness to brain damage and mental retardation. Amost all these diseases can cause death.[71]

Unfortunately, out of the 52 million children under the age of 15, almost 40 percent have not been fully immunized against one or more of the preventable childhood diseases.[72] Among the reasons offered for this extremely low rate of compliance are: (1) parental lack of awareness, (2) lack of federal and state money, and (3) lax enforcement of existing standards.

Working through the schools has been an effective mechanism for increasing compliance to the necessary 90 percent coverage level. "In April of 1977, Los Angeles County officials announced that all school-age children would be required to present evidence of having had measles or having been immunized against it to remain in school. Within a little more than one month, all but 3.5 percent of the more than one million school children in the county had met the requirement."[73] Another program in Montana showed similar progress:

> Immunization levels in Missoula schools increased substantially due to the Immunization Initiative. The efforts resulted in an 18% increase in the number of children with current records meeting all minimum immunization requirements. A total of 35% (3,440)

> children received immunizations at clinics held in 32 schools. The total cost of the program was approximately $37,000 and averaged a total of $10.75 for each child immunized.[74]

It was believed that such programs would be more effective if federal funds were guaranteed for at least five years and if a comprehensive system of health examinations were instituted. "If the U.S. would institute a comprehensive system of well-child care, then costly, fragmented and short-term programs would be unnecessary. With such an approach, immunization status and other well-child care could be routinely maintained, thus significantly increasing the benefits from effort and expenditures."[75]

Screening

Health screening is not a new burden placed on the schools. Elementary and secondary schools have traditionally performed auditory screening for hundreds of thousands of students. Currently, districts enrolling large numbers of refugees are being urged to carefully screen these children for a variety of diseases. In addition, children can be screened in school for unhealthy levels of lead in their bodies.

> In a recent screening conducted by the National Center for Disease Control, some 7,950 of 116,668 children tested showed lead toxicity. In addition to these unsuspected cases, about 12,000 to 16,000 children are treated each year nationwide for lead poisoning and survive. Unfortunately, about 200 die. Of those treated, however, about a third suffer permanent damage to the nervous system.[76]

Another potential use of screening is to identify and test those children most likely to become high risks of heart attacks in later life. Dr. Charles Glueck of the University of Cincinnati's College of Medicine recently reported:

> Many studies suggest the genesis of atherosclerosis (the narrowing and hardening of arteries which sets the stage for heart attacks and strokes) is in childhood. The age at which atherosclerosis is most reversible is certainly in the mid- to late teens . . . so if we want to prevent atherosclerosis, many of us feel we'd best begin at an age when it is most reversible."

A final area invloves screening for instances of child abuse. It is estimated that at least a million children are physically abused each year, and abuse is the fifth leading cause of death among children. Since teachers are in contact with children on a daily basis, they are in an ideal situation for reporting such crimes. "In conjunction with P.L. 93-247, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, all 50 states have enacted some form of legislation requiring reporting of

child abuse/neglect. In 42 of these states teachers and other school personnel are mandated reporters. This means that they must report to the legally designated authorities any situation in which they *suspect* a child is being abused or neglected."[78]

An expansion of traditional screening functions is now possible. The Education For All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) is being interpreted as requiring states to develop procedures for finding handicapped children and bringing them into a school environment. Thomas Lombard, state consultant for school psychological services in the Minnesota Department of Education, describes the typical response to this requirement:

> One of the top priorities of P.L. 94-142 is to identify out-of-school children with special educational needs. This provision is commonly called the "Child Find" mandate and includes pre-kindergarten children. In order to comply with this mandate, state departments of education have advised school districts to set up mass screening programs akin to the "kindergarten round-ups" which are traditionally offered in late spring or summer. The instruments used by school personnel have generally focused on kindergarten readiness skills and have seldom included health screening components.[79]

This law also provides the states with an ideal opportunity to expand such screening to cover a variety of health problems. Large numbers of poor children never see a doctor, and with the "great increase in working mothers and also in single-parent families, some educators feel children may not be seeing family doctors as regularly as they once were. As HEW says, the school could prove to be the 'primary location' for providing health screening for all children."[80] Anticipating this need, "in 1977 Minnesota became the first state to offer all children free, comprehensive health and developmental screening. A few other states have similar programs, notably California, but participation is usually based on income eligibility or is otherwise limited to some target population."[81]

The results of this Minnesota screening program are impressive. Registered nurses performed the screening of children between 3 and 6 years old. Almost 50 percent of incoming students were referred to a doctor for follow-up care based on the recommendations of these nurses. As Lombard concluded:

> Minnesota's PSS program has conclusively demonstrated that a mandated, comprehensive health screening program can be economically and expediently implemented through the public school system. From the high participation rates in Minnesota's school districts, it may be inferred that parents see a need for health screening and most will respond if it is offered by the schools. . . . If something meaningful will be learned from Minnesota's PSS

> results, it is that the health of children cannot be separated from their academic preparedness.[12]

The policy limit placed on all these screening and referral programs is the question of follow through. Medical services must be provided to meet the needs identified during the initial examination. Many of the same barriers to successful voluntary screening—lack of parent interest, lack of money, or available health practitioners—exist with the provision of remedial care. To overcome this problem, some commentators urge the actual provision of health care in elementary and secondary schools. Katherine Webster, an assistant professor of nursing at the University of North Florida, concludes:

> A health screening program should not be attempted if plans for follow-up have not been clearly formulated. It makes little sense to devote time and energy to identifying a problem and isolating particular cases if there is no provision for ensuring that those who have problems are seeking medical assistance. At a minimum, a one month and a four-to-six month follow-up should be conducted.[13]

Provision of Care

Child health care in the United States is in a deplorable state. Reuben C. Warren, assistant professor in the department of behavioral sciences and community health at the University of Connecticut's School of Dental Medicine, cites G. A. Silver's summary of this problem:

> By any standard, the U.S. children are in worse state than the children in most other countries with similar standards of living. Infant mortality—the number of children who die the first year of life per every 1,000 live births—is higher in the United States than in 15 other countries. Deaths of children under five are proportionately higher here, so are suicides among young people. Certainly we do not reach all these children with our health services. Epidemics of wholly preventable diseases like diphtheria occur, and we find at least 25% of school children unimmunized. Many school children with visual defects do not receive corrective glasses when recommended; not all deaf children receive needed hearing aids. It is not surprising then, when surveys show that as many as 5 million children have no regular source of medical care and that 40 million children under 17 have not been examined by a doctor within the last two years.[14]

School districts are now becoming more involved with the actual delivery of health services to the student. One example is furnished by "the participation of the Irvine Unified School District in the California Child Health Disability Prevention (CHDP) program. . . . The California CHDP program incorporates federal guidelines for Early

Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) which stresses the need for preventive health care for children.'"[45] The experience of this district indicates that the school provides an ideal setting for providing a state-mandated entry physical examination for all students.[46] The likelihood is that schools will be used increasingly in this role in the future. Dr. Warren notes:

> As the nation progresses toward a national health insurance program, it is expected that school-based health care systems will be a viable alternative to existing health care delivery methods. This may be the only realistic way to improve the health of the nation's children, especially those that are indigent and living in dentally and medically underserved areas.[47]

Both school administrators and doctors express some reservations about this development. Concern is expressed that budgetary limits would not allow such expansion of services and that the role of the school as an educational institution would be compromised. Bess Buser, co-director of the pediatric nurse practitioner program at State University of New York's Upstate Medical Center, provides a comprehensive list of advantages for using the school as a provider of care:

> Those persons in favor of these services in the schools cite the advantages: (1) schools are where the captive clientele are, so take the services to them, (2) the convenience and the money saved are important to homes with two employed parents and to one-parent homes, (3) 75% of childhood diseases are minor and self-limiting and thus manageable at school, (4) school-age population decline provides more space and personnel in the school sites, (5) organized classes provide pre-identified groups for age-appropriate screening procedures, (6) present health care delivery systems range from nothing for large geographic areas to superbly organized, luxury care, (7) the school nurse is traditionally the first and sometimes the only contact with health care, (8) the school nurse practitioner will have more refined skills for preventive care and for treating minor, acute and chronic problems, thus freeing the physician's greater expertise for more useful services.[48]

The Learning Environment

Not only would the concept of minimum education standards cover situations involving handicapped students, desegregation, and education for aliens and refugees or various curricular issues, but it also deals with the learning environment which allows education to thrive. One example is the tremendous increase in crime on school campuses. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration reports that about 8 percent of all personal crimes in large cities occur in schools.[49] A recent survey by the American Association of School Administrators

revealed that: "the most serious discipline problems . . . are student smoking, insubordination, use of marijuana, and use of alcohol. Rounding out the top 10 discipline concerns are tardiness, absenteeism, class cutting, vandalism, and theft of student property. The problems mentioned least frequently by administrators were weapons on campus, assaults on teachers, and student gangs."[90] Such behavior is seriously disruptive of the educational process. Willard McGuire of the NEA concludes: "if we are to teach and students are to learn, we must be free from fear. A healthy educational climate that nurtures the minds and releases the spirit must also protect the body."[91] There are, however, remedies to the problem of school violence. The School Administrators survey also described more than 50 ways in which schools have successfully dealt with such discipline problems.

Food also plays an important part in the learning environment. Research has shown that good nutrition is linked to good education. Based on this information, the federal government has developed free or reduced-price breakfast and lunch programs.

> Last year, the number of schools serving breakfast rose from 24,000 to 30,000. The number of children eating breakfast at school rose to a new high of 3.3 million, up 300,000 in a year. But the magnitude of the federally subsidized breakfast program is small compared to its well-entrenched partner, the National School Lunch Program. About 27 million students, in 93,000 schools, eat lunch at school.[92]

This program is currently targeted for a budget reduction under the current administration. Another nutrition-based program is the new U.S. Department of Agriculture "junk food" regulations which should significantly reduce the amount of nonnutritious food sold in schools.[93]

Another issue which impacts the educational system is compulsory school attendance laws.

> All states except Mississippi now have compulsory school attendance laws. Most states require attendance from ages 6 to 16; seven states require attendance to age 18. The passage of compulsory education laws and child labor laws took place at approximately the same time in each state. Each law was presented and enacted for humanitarian and child welfare reasons. Over the years the courts have upheld compulsory attendance.[94]

The long-standing assumption that such laws are in the best interest of students and society should be reexamined. As David Moberly, superintendent of the Seattle Public Schools, notes:

> It is urgent that teachers, school administrators, and boards of education give attention to increasing the number of alternatives

> available to young people within our school systems. Compulsory schooling has not created the incentive to provide such alternative programs. Rather, it has fostered a population of bitter youth who see no point to, or cannot succeed in, a narrow college-oriented curriculum. Perhaps educators should be forced to compete with on-the-job training programs in business and industry or with other types of training that could be offered by local, state, and national agencies."

A final issue which is often claimed to affect pupil achievement is class size. Research results are divided on the significance that class size plays in the learning process. Mary Smith's and Gene Glass's research on class size has concluded that "On all measures, reduction in class size is associated with higher quality schooling and more positive attitudes," thus echoing the conclusion of their first report on this subject, which indicated that class size has a "substantial" impact on student achievement. The two analysts converted data from more than 80 studies into one set. Indications were that the smaller the class, the higher the achievement and the better the student attitudes and teacher attitudes.[4] However, a report produced by the Educational Research Service indicates:

> Research to date provides no support for the concept of an "optimum" class size in isolation of other factors. Rather, the indicators are that efficient class sizes are a product of many variables, including subject area, nature and number of pupils in the classroom, nature of learning objectives, availability of materials and facilities, instructional methods and procedures used, skills and temperament of the teacher and support staff, and budgetary constraints. . . ."

Other changes in the learning environment might include modification of vacation time, longer school days, greater involvement of parents in the school, and additional support facilities and equipment.

Conclusions

The minimum standards resolution covers a broad range of current education issues. It must be remembered that many of these problems are interrelated. Addition of another course or more time devoted to one subject translates to less time and resources devoted to another subject, *ceteris paribus*. Similarly education standards without qualified teachers or sufficient funds for implementation are usually ignored by local districts. Changes cannot be made in isolation; rather the impact on the educational process must be explored.

3 School Finance

Resolved: That a Uniform System of Financing Elementary and Secondary Education in the United States Should Be Adopted.

Basic Concepts

In the initial balloting that selected the education problem area, the resolution on school finance finished second. However, the issues involved with funding programs are closely related to the setting of minimum education standards. Establishing new standards without providing the necessary money for training, books, staffing, and related support is usually an empty gesture. As Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers notes: "The very government and court system which is now insisting that schools provide education for the handicapped, bilingual education, due process procedures for disruptive students, desegregated instruction, etc., is refusing to provide the necessary funds to make these things happen."[1]

The prospect for future increases in aid to elementary and secondary education appears bleak. President Reagan has indicated a desire to cut federal aid by over 22%. Forty states, according to a National Education Association study, have tax ceilings or spending limits beyond which they cannot go.[2] In addition, both state and local governments are susceptible to increased voter pressure to keep taxes low. There has been some moderation in the tone of the taxpayer revolt. "One reason is that state and local officials are asking to borrow less. The value of bond issues proposed this year was down 25 percent from 1978 and 40 percent from 1974. It was less than a third of the record $9.1 billion in borrowing asked in 1968. Another reason for voter moderation, some analysts believe, is that elected officials already have eased the bite of state and local levies in response to pressure from taxpayers."[3] While the tone may have changed, most observers still believe that the issue of tax limitation will continue to have an important impact on policy. The Council of State Government concludes:

> There are likely to be some new issues that should emerge during the first half of the decade. The first of these will likely be a continuation, in some way in nearly all states, of the tax and expen-

> diture limitation movement initiated by Proposition 13 in California. There was a great deal of activity across the country in the wake of that vote, and tax and expenditure limitation activities are a continuing issue in many states. Tax and spending limitations on the public sectors, including schools, are reflective of the underlying economic problems affecting the country. Until the phenomena of high inflation, more taxes, a rising government sector, expanding education programs, and increasing education budgets abate significantly, the push by the electorate to impose limitations will probably continue.[4]

The oft-cited example of California's Proposition 13 has been used to demonstrate both that such reduced funding has little impact on education and that the delayed effects of such tax limits will prove devastating. Typical expressions of the former view are similar to the following statement:

> For a year now Californians have been told repeatedly by state leaders that the public sector—and the services it provides—have been bailed out. For the most part, they say, everything is fine. Thus voters have been reassured that they did the right thing on 6 June 1978. They believe the claim so often made by Prop 13 supporters before the election: "Don't worry, they'll get the money somewhere."
>
> Not surprisingly, voters in other states—some without a potential bailout—are flirting with their own Proposition 13s. They point to California as the success story, as the place where the tax revolt worked. Public services were not hurt, it is reported, and perhaps, being leaner, they are now a little better.[5]

Because the state spent $5 billion of its state surplus to bail out local governments, the immediate effects of this tax limit were not evident. But an accumulation of subtle changes in support for education is building up to a serious deterioration in services. Class size was increasing in many special programs, teachers and administrators who left teaching were not replaced, pupil services were cut, and nurses, psychologists, and child welfare workers were fired. As Gary Hoban concluded:

> Since the daily school program of most children *looks* much the same, the public does not perceive some important changes that are occurring. In most cases these changes are slow. They result from deferred or eliminated improvements in instructional programs, failure to replace worn or outmoded equipment and instructional materials, reduced or abandoned inservice programs for teachers, unbuilt facilities, canceled field trips, elimination of transportation capabilities, and reduction of class offerings, to name but a few. In many ways, to cope with the classroom situation of today, schools are living off their resources of the past with little ability to prepare for the future.[6]

The overall level of education expenditures should moderately increase. Using data from several sources, Stanford University education professor Michael Kirst and Dean Walter Garms of the University of Rochester estimate "that public school expenditures will be in the range of $78 billion to $83 billion (in 1975–76 dollars) by 1985–86, as against about $75 billion in 1975–76. This is substantially lower than the $93.5 billion projected by the National Center for Education Statistics as its best estimate. For several years, education has been losing ground relative to other social services, and we project this trend to continue."[7] These expenditures are supported by a combination of federal, state, and local revenue as shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Revenue Receipts of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools from Federal, State, and Local Sources: United States, 1919–20 to 1977–78

School Year	Total	Federal	State	Local (Including Intermediate)[1]	School Year	Total	Federal	State	Local (Including Intermediate)[1]
1	3	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	(Amount In Thousands of Dollars)					(Percentage Distribution)			
1919-20	$ 970,120	$ 2,475	$ 160,085	$ 807,561	1919-20	100.0	0.3	16.5	83.2
1929-30	2,088,557	7,334	353,670	1,727,553	1929-30	100.0	.4	16.9	82.7
1939-40	2,260,527	39,810	684,354	1,536,363	1939-40	100.0	1.8	30.3	68.0
1941-42	2,416,580	34,305	759,993	1,622,281	1941-42	100.0	1.4	31.4	67.1
1943-44	2,604,322	35,886	859-183	1,709,253	1943-44	100.0	1.4	33.0	65.6
1945-46	3,059,845	41,378	1,062,057	1,956,400	1945-46	100.0	1.4	34.7	63.9
1947-48	4,311,534	120,270	1,676.362	2,514,902	1947-48	100.0	2.8	38.9	58.3
1949-50	5,437,044	155,848	2,165,689	3,115,507	1949-50	100.0	2.9	39.8	57.3
1951-52	6,423,816	227,711	2,478,596	3,717,507	1951-52	100.0	3.5	38.6	57.8
1953-54	7,866,852	355,237	2,944,103	4,567,512	1953-54	100.0	4.5	37.4	58.1
1955-56	9,686,677	441,442	3,828,886	5,416,350	1955-56	100.0	4.6	39.5	55.9
1957-58	12,181,513	486,484	4,800,368	6,894,661	1957-58	100.0	4.0	39.4	56.6
1959-60	14,746,618	651,639	5,768,047	8,326,932	1959-60	100.0	4.4	39.1	56.5
1961-62	17,527,707	760,975	6,789,190	9,977,542	1961-62	100.0	4.3	38.7	56.9
1963-64	20,544,182	896,956	8,078,014	11,569,213	1963-64	100.0	4.4	39.3	56.3
1965-66	25,356,858	1,996,954	9,920,219	13,439,686	1965-66	100.0	7.9	39.1	53.0
1967-68	31,903,064	2,806,469	12,275,536	16,821,063	1967-68	100.0	8.8	38.5	52.7
1969-70	40,266,923	3,219,557	16,062,776	20,984,589	1969-70	100.0	8.0	39.9	52.1
1971-72	50,003,645	4,467,969	19,133,256	26,402,420	1971-72	100.0	8.9	38.3	52.8
1973-74	58,230,892	4,930,351	24,113,409	29,187,132	1973-74	100.0	8.5	41.4	50.1
1975-76	71,206,073	6,318,345	31,776,101	33,111,627	1975-76	100.0	8.9	44.6	46.5
1977-78	81,440,326	7,699,042	35,005,584	38,735,700	1977-78	100.0	9.5	43.0	47.6

[1]Includes a relatively small amount from nongovernmental sources (gifts and tuition and transportation fees from patrons). These sources accounted for 0.4 percent of total revenue receipts in 1967-68.

Note: Beginning in 1959-60, includes Alaska and Hawaii. Because of rounding, details may not add to totals.

Sources: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, *Statistics of State School Systems; and Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 1977-78.*

From: *Digest of Education Statistics*, 1980.

Funding Mix

Historically, elementary and secondary education has been primarily funded by local government. The major local tax revenue devoted to education has been the property tax, while construction projects usually have been funded through bonds. There has been a steady increase in the percentage of revenue received from federal and state sources, as represented in Table 9.

Table 9

Revenue per Pupil for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, by Source and by State: 1976–77.

State	Revenue per Pupil						
		Federal		State		Local	
	Total	Amount	Percent of Total	Amount	Percent of Total	Amount	Percent of Total
United States	$1,700	$150	8.8	$738	43.4	$813	47.8
Alabama	1,175	193	16.4	719	61.2	263	22.4
Alaska	3,307	276	8.4	2,381	72.0	650	19.7
Arizona	1,745	174	10.0	865	49.8	706	40.4
Arkansas	1,136	177	15.6	566	49.8	393	34.6
California	1,891	162	8.6	765	40.4	964	51.0
Colorado	1,925	124	6.4	715	37.2	1,086	56.4
Connecticut	1,598	84	5.3	394	24.7	1,120	70.1
Delaware	2,012	196	9.7	1,378	68.5	438	21.8
District of Columbia	2,094	795	37.9	1,299	62.1	0	0
Florida	1,629	166	10.2	867	53.2	596	36.6
Georgia	1,191	152	12.8	557	46.8	482	40.4
Hawaii	1,737	241	13.9	1,497	86.1	0	0
Idaho	1,212	140	11.6	518	42.8	553	45.7
Illinois	1,817	119	6.5	696	38.3	1,002	55.1
Indiana	1,457	86	5.9	720	49.4	851	44.7
Iowa	1,753	101	5.8	665	38.0	986	56.3
Kansas	1,537	128	8.3	606	39.4	103	52.3
Kentucky	1,264	173	13.7	725	57.4	366	29.0
Louisiana	1,377	248	18.0	738	53.6	391	28.4
Maine	1,294	119	9.2	575	44.4	600	46.4
Maryland	1,968	151	7.7	779	39.6	1,038	52.7
Massachusetts	2,261	113	5.0	715	31.6	1,434	63.4
Michigan	1,849	118	6.4	823	44.5	908	49.1
Minnesota	2,021	121	6.0	1,167	58.0	725	36.0
Mississippi	1,017	236	23.3	578	56.9	202	19.9
Missouri	1,343	127	9.4	487	36.3	729	54.3
Montana	1,796	175	9.7	907	50.5	714	39.8
Nebraska	1,571	121	7.7	308	19.6	1,142	72.7
Nevada	1,519	111	7.3	548	36.1	368	56.6
New Hampshire	1,386	82	5.9	115	8.3	1,189	85.8
New Jersey	2,129	128	6.0	784	36.8	1,218	57.2
New Mexico	1,474	314	21.3	912	61.9	247	16.8
New York	2,382	142	5.9	925	38.8	1,315	55.2
North Carolina	1,234	182	14.7	787	63.8	266	21.5
North Dakota	1,572	185	11.8	685	43.6	702	44.7
Ohio	1,436	92	6.4	583	40.6	762	53.0
Oklahoma	1,415	171	12.1	753	53.2	491	34.7
Oregon	1,986	164	8.3	509	25.6	1,313	66.1
Pennsylvania	1,891	165	8.7	845	44.7	88	46.6
Rhode Island	1,628	142	8.7	520	31.9	967	59.4
South Carolina	1,304	222	17.0	711	54.5	371	28.5
South Dakota	1,447	194	13.4	253	17.5	1,000	69.1
Tennessee	1,246	156	12.5	599	48.1	491	39.4
Texas	1,465	171	11.7	683	46.7	610	41.7
Utah	1,388	136	9.8	748	53.9	505	36.4
Vermont	1,660	113	6.8	462	27.8	1,085	65.3
Virginia	1,526	168	11.0	494	32.4	863	56.6
Washington	1,695	155	9.1	1,020	60.1	521	30.7
West Virginia	1,370	147	10.8	833	60.8	390	28.5
Wisconsin	1,742	85	4.9	626	36.0	1,030	59.2
Wyoming	2,015	143	7.1	587	29.1	1,285	63.8

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, *Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 1976–77*, 1978.

From: *The Condition of Education*, 1980.

Data from the National Education Association (NEA) indicate that "for the first time in the history of tax-supported education in the U.S., states in 1978–79 will contribute more than the local governments to the cost of running schools. . . . While the percentage difference isn't large—states will provide 47.4% of the funds, local sources 43.8%, and the federal government 8.8%—the shift represents a trend away from traditional local funding of education."[8] One of the major reasons for this was the fact that the state of California, after Proposition 13, increased its contribution to education from "38% or $3.4 billion in 1977–78 to 64.9% or $5.6 billion in 1978–79. If California were excluded from the national totals, local funding would exceed state, but only by the narrow margin of 0.5%—45.5% state and 46% local."[9] However, the NEA reports, the trend toward greater state involvement in public elementary and secondary education was well under way before California's significant increase in aid.

The advantage of multiple funding sources is that they allow each level of government to institute special education programs which meet the needs of a particular constituency. This also allows for a diversity of experimental approaches in solving common problems. Finally, they allow each succeeding level of government to redress imbalances in the total aid given to education. There are, however, significant disadvantages of multiparty involvement in the financing of education. A few of the more commonly enumerated problems include: (1) wasteful duplication of programs, (2) time-consuming rules, regulations, and red tape, (3) lack of coordination, (4) distortion of local funding priorities through matching requirements, (5) barriers to disseminating information, (6) increased centralization of power in state and federal governments, and (7) nonresponsive programs for local needs. Many of these issues will be explained as federal aid to elementary and secondary education is examined.

Federal Funds

The federal government is involved in the financing of elementary and secondary education through both indirect and direct mechanisms. Indirectly, through use of religious or charitable Internal Revenue Service (IRS) exemptions, the government eliminates the need for certain private or church-related schools to pay taxes. The oil windfall profits tax law

> exempts from the tax the crude oil revenues received by school districts and state and local governments. State and local governments earning profits from oil production would have to spend the money for public purposes, including education, to escape the tax. The school district exemption would apply to oil interests held by

> educational institutions as of January 21, 1980. An estimated 22 states own interests in crude oil production.[10]

Thus, by foregoing the option to collect taxes on certain revenue, the government is, in effect, increasing the net amount of funds that are spent on education.

In a less circumspect manner, the federal government directly allocates money for use by elementary and secondary schools. One of the most important sources of funds is not even an education grant; rather it is the general revenue sharing program. Federal revenue sharing returns unencumbered funds to states and localities for use in meeting their major needs. Of the $2 billion received by the states, almost one-third is given for public elementary and secondary education. This has become a critical source of funding, according to the National Governors' Association. "Twelve states—Florida, Illinois, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin—spend all of the revenue-sharing money for elementary and secondary education."[11] In addition, six states put a substantial amount into schools: Hawaii (23 percent), New York (29 percent), North Carolina (37 percent), Pennsylvania (68 percent), and Rhode Island (20 percent). "Many states use the money to fund an 'equalization formula,' whereby poor districts get extra funding. Pennsylvania uses $55 million for school buses. With its revenue-sharing money, North Carolina fully pays for textbooks and school buses throughout the state."[12]

The federal government also provides a host of direct grants-in-aid to a wide range of special interests. Special programs are funded for Indians, Eskimos, and refugees, the mentally gifted, the learning disabled, special education, the bilingual, and the physically handicapped. While justification for federal involvement was provided in Chapter 1, there is a cost associated with such aid. Chris Pipho of the Education Commission of the States warned: "along with the federal money came problems of federal priorities taking precedence over local priorities, state governments finding a shortage of money to provide matching grants, duplication of federal programs, and lack of coordination between federal and state programs."[13] Despite these problems, some commentators urge increased reliance on federal funding. Terry Hearndon, executive director of the NEA points out that

> Our public schools are being asked to do more and more, even as experts proclaim that funding levels are not sufficient to meet prior expectations. Many local and state governments have exhausted their taxing capabilities and simply cannot provide comprehensive educational opportunity for *all* of their diverse students. Moreover, the poorer school districts cannot close the gaps between their pro-

> grams and those of the wealthier districts. The only practical answer is general federal aid to education in substantial quantity.[14]

The federal taxing structure, with its reliance on the income tax, has several commonly claimed advantages, specifically: (1) an income tax is a progressive tax, (2) the income tax is efficiently collected, (3) the income tax spreads the burden throughout the states, (4) the income tax is uniform for all citizens in a net income bracket, and (5) income tax revenues increase automatically with economic growth. A commitment to greater use of noncategorical federal grants is seen as one method for providing uniform financing of elementary and secondary education.

State and Local Effort

Despite the attention given to federal intervention in elementary and secondary education, federal funds contribute less than 10% of the total money received by these public schools. In contrast, educational outlays are the major part of most state budgets, ranging from 30% to 70% of total state expenditures. State governments are feeling fiscal pressures which could restrict the size of the overall budget. For the long term, "problems of the 1980s will center on the Proposition 13-type initiatives, budget caps and lids, and various controls on spending at a time of double-digit inflation, spiraling energy-related costs, and declining enrollments. Voters appear to be moving away from enactment of Proposition 13-type mandates, but the overriding issue will be rising costs and fewer students."[15] These problems are compounded by the current recession which has already produced a greater effect on short-term revenue. As Chris Pipho notes: "a couple of states had to make major budget reallocations in mid-1980 because tax revenues were falling behind original estimates. Oregon called a special legislative session to handle this problem and Iowa's governor, Robert Ray, gave a special midsession budget message to the legislature as a result of declining revenues."[16]

Coupled with this recent concern of lowered revenue is the peaking of the wave of school finance reform. "In its landmark 1971 decision, *Serrano* v. *Priest*, the California Supreme Court found that the state system of financing education resulted in substantial disparities among school districts in per-pupil revenues. These inequities arose from the state's heavy reliance on the local property tax to generate school revenues, and from variations in the taxable wealth of the districts. Thus, the court ruled, the school finance system discriminated against those who lived in low property-wealth districts and violated their constitutional rights to equal educational opportunity."[17] The Rand Cor-

poration noted the impact of this decision on subsequent state action: "The *Serrano* victory touched off a race for reform that promptly saw 52 similar actions filed in 31 states. When the dust settled, nearly half the states in the nation had restructured or greatly modified their educational finance systems. No generally agreed on blueprint for reform emerged, however, and the states adopted a variety of approaches to the problem."[18] Although there is no uniform structure for school finance reform, a common element for each was an increase in state money for education. These new funds were used to help equalize local variations in per pupil expenditures. Another similarity is that virtually every major reform was instituted before 1974, and therefore avoided a direct clash with those forces now attempting to lower state expenditures. Susan Fuhrman, a research associate at the Eagleton Institute of Politics, contrasts the reform movement since 1974:

> Most of these reforms took place by the end of 1974, in a period characterized by relative fiscal plenty. States didn't have to face the politically dreaded choice of redistributing from rich to poor districts on the one hand or raising taxes on the other. They had enough surplus funds to compensate property-poor districts without harming wealthier districts; direct confrontation between haves and have nots could be avoided. Reformers capitalized on resistance to growing local tax burdens by showing the relationship between an increased state share for equalization and decreased local property taxes. During the mid-1970s, when the economy was in recession, fewer states had reforms. Some, like Connecticut, South Dakota, and South Carolina, passed reforms without funding them. Others, like New Jersey, became embroiled in major battles over new tax sources.[19]

Resource Disparity

The rationale for state reform of education finance is the existence of disparities in the amount of resources devoted to education. These differences exist between the states as evidenced in Table 10 and between districts within a state.

Table 10

Expenditure per Pupil in Average Daily Attendance in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, by State: 1977-78

State or other area	Expenditure per Pupil			
	Total[1]	Current[2]	Capital Outlay[3]	Interest on School Debt
1	2	3	4	5
United States	$2,002	$1,823	$131	$49
Alabama	1,498	1,401	[4]87	[4]10
Alaska	4,113	[5]3,625	[4]350	[4]138
Arizona	1,966	[4]1,636	277	52
Arkansas	1,347	1,204	112	32
California	2,004	1,864	118	23
Colorado	2,258	1,895	298	65
Connecticut	2,056	1,962	48	46
Delaware	2,271	2,075	105	91
District of Columbia	2,832	2,706	126	- -
Florida	1,693	1,520	139	34
Georgia	1,507	[4]1,338	[4]148	[4]20
Hawaii	2,172	2,017	151	3
Idaho	1,584	1,380	169	35
Illinois	2,118	1,945	121	53
Indiana	1,657	1,479	130	49
Iowa	1,990	1,835	124	32
Kansas	1,777	1,668	76	33
Kentucky	1,394	1,283	66	45
Louisiana	1,648	1,511	97	40
Maine	1,551	[4]1,446	60	45
Maryland	2,360	2,095	221	44
Massachusetts	2,458	2,322	59	78
Michigan	2,307	[2]2,107	129	71
Minnesota	2,212	1,982	163	67
Mississippi	1,395	1,304	91	1
Missouri	1,657	1,534	88	35
Montana	2,259	[4]1,980	250	29
Nebraska	1,950	1,731	169	49
Nevada	1,955	1,645	219	91
New Hampshire	1,654	[4]1,467	145	42
New Jersey	2,518	2,426	45	47
New Mexico	1,703	1,585	98	20
New York	2,944	2,819	53	72
North Carolina	1,507	1,392	102	[4]12
North Dakota	1,766	1,609	133	24
Ohio	1,704	1,589	80	35
Oklahoma	1,634	1,476	142	16
Oregon	2,404	2,107	251	46
Pennsylvania	2,307	2,043	110	155
Rhode Island	2,152	2,083	[4]13	55
South Carolina	1,515	1,345	128	42
South Dakota	1,516	1,482	11	23
Tennessee	1,487	1,331	143	13
Texas	1,927	1,567	315	[4]66
Utah	1,644	1,341	264	39
Vermont	1,799	1,681	78	39
Virginia	1,688	1,504	135	49
Washington	2,151	[2]1,993	[4]124	[4]34
West Virginia	1,628	1,510	80	38
Wisconsin	2,166	1,975	142	49
Wyoming	2,454	1,955	422	77

[1] Includes current expenditures for day schools, capital outlay, and interest on school debt.
[2] Includes expenditures for day schools only; excludes adult education, community colleges, and community services.
[3] Includes capital outlays by State and local schoolhousing authorities.
[4] Data are for 1976-77.
[5] Estimated.
[6] Data are for 1975-76.

Note: Because of rounding, details may not add to totals.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, *Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 1977-78;* and unpublished data.

From: *Digest of Education Statistics*, 1980.

Data supplied by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) indicate that:

> The National average core current expenditure per pupil was $1,287. More than 60% of total enrollment was found in school districts that spent more than $1,400 per pupil; 22 percent was in school districts that spent under $1,200 per pupil; and only 17 percent was in school districts that had expenditures per pupil within the same interval that contained the National average ($1,200 to $1,399).[20]

Eugene McLoone, a specialist in school finance for the NCES, is quick to caution that evidence of unequal spending is not sufficient information to conclude that such variations are unwarranted:

> Not all differences in spending are undesirable. Student needs may vary because of physical, cultural, or economic handicaps; cost-of-living factors may account for differences in local wages or in teacher supply and demand. Also, uncontrollable cost differences may result from variations in density of population, pupil transportation requirements, enrollment in certain high-cost programs (such as vocational education), and differences in the proportions of pupils in higher-cost secondary education programs. Ideally, measures of disparities in expenditures should correct for such factors. Unfortunately, available data do not permit such refinements.[21]

One of the major contributors of such differences in education spending is the variation in the financial resources available to school districts. The key to such variations is the local property tax:

> Property taxes are the most important revenue generator for elementary and secondary education. The size of property tax revenue is contingent upon the value of the property to be taxed and the tax rate applied to that property wealth. Given the same tax rate, areas with greater property wealth can raise more tax revenue than areas with lower property wealth. On the other hand, an area with twice the property wealth of another area can raise an equal amount of revenue by imposing a tax rate only half the rate of the lower wealth area.[22]

This inherent inequity caused by reliance on the local property tax has caused great concern that students in poorer districts are being denied equal education opportunity.

Equal Opportunity

The major goal of finance reform is to provide equal educational opportunity for students within a state. There are a variety of definitions of exactly what "equity" in the educational context entails. When examining changes in a school finance system, the standard of measure-

ment used is extremely important. Berne and Stiefel of New York University report that:

> Analyses of school finance systems utilize many different procedures to evaluate the equity of a state's system over time. For example, a recent issue of the *Journal of Education Finance* was entirely devoted to reports of evaluations of twelve state systems that had recently undergone reform. No two of these twelve reports used the same methodology for evaluation.[23]

Concepts of equity change, depending on the views of the author. Thomas Timar, a policy consultant, and James Guthrie, a professor at the University of California in Berkeley, explain: "The problem stems in part from the difficulty of deriving an acceptable definition of equity and of determining what constitutes a 'just' distribution of educational services which led to a more inclusive standard that considered the quality of educational services available in a school."[24] The Rand Corporation saw two mutually exclusive concepts of equity emerge during finance debates: *equalization* and *fiscal neutrality*.

> The major aim of proponents of equalization is to distribute per-pupil spending equally across districts. Those who favor fiscal neutrality, on the other hand, are not concerned with whether one school district spends more than another, but want to insure that schools have equal access to educational goods and services. According to this view, each school district should be free to choose its own level of spending, and the state's school finance system should allow any district to obtain the same level of funding as any other district, provided it exerts the same tax effort.[25]

Yet another distinction is drawn by Bruce Johnston:

> Even though commentators have written extensively about "equal educational opportunity," the definition is by no means clear. Opportunity measured on equal "inputs" is basically an objective standard, with money as the measuring stick. This philosophy contends that where there are wide disparities in expenditure levels among districts, there will be wide disparities in the quality of education and opportunities among those districts. Measuring educational opportunity by inputs makes it easy to measure amounts of money given, and even if there is no exact "cost-quality" correlation in education, everyone begins monetarily equal.
>
> On the other hand, the "outputs" measurement of equal educational opportunity is a subjective performance test based on student achievement. Proponents of this technique advocate standardized testing and other similar methods of measuring the quality of education. Student expenditures are irrelevant.[26]

For the next decade, the concept of equity will be involved with the shifts in the fortunes of general fiscal pressures besetting the states. *The Book of the States* predicts that

> . . . school finance reform debates in the late 1980s will entail program and service equalization rather than fiscal equalization. Indeed, the variety of attempts to define basic education across state legislatures is but one indication of this effort and shift in the focus of education finance policy. Admittedly, the state of the art of knowledge that allows program and service definition is far from precise, but the need to move on this frontier is apparent.[27]

There are specific problems associated with use of any of these standards to measure equal opportunity, especially if remediation of the inequality is supposed to lead to better student performance. As noted in Chapter 2, measurements of student performance via testing are certainly suspect as a valid indication of achievement. Nor is tax effort, which is described as the "degree to which a state, through state and local taxation, uses its taxpaying capacity to support public elementary and secondary schools within the state,"[28] a valid indicator of true citizen sacrifice for education. As McLoone explains:

> A widely used indicator of taxpayer effort is a state's total state and local revenues as a percentage of total personal income. The average for all states is almost exactly 5 percent, and the range is from 6.69 for Alaska to 3.70 for Mississippi. While this is an easily computed ratio, it does not allow for the fact that a state derives revenues from both its own residents and from citizens of other states. And it cannot be assumed that the flow of revenue across state lines is balanced. Some states receive significantly more revenues from the citizens of other states, than their citizens pay out to other states. These states are exporters of their tax burden.[29]

A recent study of this problem indicates that 13 states are net tax burden supporters: Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming. All other states were importers.[30]

Nor is there uncontroverted evidence that spending more money necessarily increases the quality of education. Early studies by Coleman and Jencks concluded that money has little effect on education. Although these results are hotly disputed by the findings of other researchers, the existence of such contradicting studies indicates "the current inadequacy of social science to clearly delineate the relationship between cost and quality."[31]

A final problem is that parity in per pupil expenditure may actually create real inequalities for certain segments of the community. For example, it is noted that "a fixed number of dollars buys poorer quality educational services in large urban districts than in suburban school

districts. Proponents of this position argue that the physical, social, and economic environment of the cities necessitates a redistribution of resources to meet the greater financial burden of urban schools."[32]

Yet another example is the provision of special educational services to physically and mentally handicapped students and to students requiring bilingual instruction. As Timar and Guthrie concluded: "The inability of school districts to serve adequately the needs of such handicapped students has long been recognized by school officials. However, specialized services are extraordinarily expensive; school budgets will simply not stretch to provide them."[33] Therefore allocation of resources must be based on the added cost of providing such special services, rather than on a straight per capita basis.

A recently released Rand Corporation study empirically examined the effects of recent school finance reform in five states—California, Florida, Kansas, Michigan, and New Mexico. The conclusions of the study are summarized as follows:

1. Equity remains an elusive goal. Although some small gains have been made toward a fairer distribution of revenue, the disparities among districts—whether wealthy or poor, urban or rural, large or small, white or non-white—remain. In every case, the districts that had greater revenues per pupil before reform turned out to have greater revenues per pupil after reform.
2. In general, the investigators found, reforms in the five states studied have not dramatically altered the relationships that originally gave rise to reform efforts.
3. The reforms, however, have produced substantial progress toward *tax* equity, according to the study. In all states except Florida, disparities in tax rates have been considerably reduced. Moreover, with the exception of Michigan, local property tax rates for education declined in all five states in the postreform period. Reform, the researchers observe, seems to have been a generally effective device for equalizing the burden of *supporting* education.
4. Reform brought impressive increases in spending for education. In principle, equalization could have taken the form of redistributing revenues from high-spending districts to low-spending districts. But such an approach runs aground on the reef of hard political reality, and the reform states have chosen instead to increase overall state educational aid, attempting thereby to raise the revenues of lower-spending districts without reducing those of higher-spending ones. The result has been to increase the state revenues going to public education above what they otherwise would have been.
5. An increase in a school district's revenue did not necessarily mean a proportional increase in the amount of money spent for instructional purposes. [The researchers] hypothesize that most school districts broadly agree on what constitutes an acceptable instructional program, and exert every effort to provide one, but that, in doing so, low revenue districts make do with disproportionately

> few noninstructional resources. Thus, when a poor district receives a budget increase, it devotes some of the additional funds to improving the instructional program, but a much larger share goes to "catching up" in such areas as administration and plant maintenance and operation.[34]

The Rand researchers concluded that these efforts at reform failed for two reasons: each plan allowed for some level of local discretion in adjusting expenditures; and each reform of school finance law also tried to accommodate other political objectives.

Models for Reform

Reliance upon the local property tax as the primary source for school funding leads to wide variations in per capita pupil expenditure between districts. One solution mentioned earlier is to provide federal funding for education. This would provide uniform financing for elementary and secondary education. Another alternative is to provide for full state funding of education combined with abolition of the property tax. There are several advantages to this approach. "It provides an easy means of equalizing expenditures between districts, and affords the opportunity to take differences in educational needs and local costs into account. State funding gives the state legislatures the flexibility to balance educational costs among various tax bases and to channel funds to the educational needs and socioeconomic character of school districts."[35] This solution has been recommended by numerous governors and study groups. "Full state funding has been completely endorsed by the Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Relations, the President's Commission on School Finance, the State of Hawaii, Former Governor Anderson of Minnesota, Governor Milliken of Michigan, the New York Commission on Quality, Cost, and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the Citizen's Commission on Maryland Government."[36]

In his examination of reform options available to Missouri, Bruce Johnston details three other choices:

> A. *District Power Equalizing*—Basically, this system is a commitment by the state to the principle that the relationship between effort (the tax rate a district decides to levy) and offering (money the district spends on education) of each district will be the same. Each district determines its own effort. At any given tax level, every local district raises the same amount of money per pupil through local revenue plus state aid. The problem with district power equalizing is that the state fixes the number of dollars that can be spent by the district (although it does guarantee that amount).

B. *School District Reorganization*—This plan involves re-drawing districts to provide equal assessed valuation per pupil in each district. The problem with this approach is the subsequent fluctuation in property value. Constant re-drawing is necessary to keep the districts "equal."
C. *"Beefed-up" Foundation Plan*—Missouri could subsidize the present system to assure a per-pupil expenditure level by such local district near that of the wealthiest districts. This plan, however, requires an immense amount of state aid, and it still links private wealth to school spending. In addition, adopting a full state funding program leaves this high expenditure option open at the state's desire.[37]

The foundation plan referred to above assures every district a state guaranteed minimum per pupil expenditure.

There are several disadvantages in placing a greater emphasis on state or federal funds including: (1) increased competition for scarce state or federal funds, (2) loss of local constituency for quality education, (3) acceleration of middle class flight to private schools, and (4) decreased local autonomy. Another difficulty often encountered is the issue of local enrichment. In other words, may local districts allocate additional revenues over and above those provided under full state or federal funding? "Some studies recommend against such local aid because it reinstates the element of inequality. Stimulation of local incentive, however, weighs in the favor of such aid. Local enrichment allows school districts optional school improvements, as well as surplus revenue for possible errors in the state distributional formula or other unpredicted expenses."[38]

Tax Credits

Until now, the issues involved with uniform financing have dealt with aid to public elementary and secondary schools. Yet almost 20% of all elementary and secondary schools are private or religiously affiliated.[39] These institutions do receive limited forms of government aid. For example, states often supply bus service and health services to students attending such schools. Government scholarships or veteran education benefits are paid to private colleges and universities for eligible students. An important additional benefit is the tax exemption furnished such schools by the IRS code.

The idea behind most tax credit proposals is to cushion the impact of tuition charged by private schools by allowing a tax write-off for a portion of the paid tuition. "Tax credits can be designed in endless variations, and it is impossible to analyze all of their features here; however, most versions provide a flat amount (say $250) to be subtracted from tax liability if net tuition charges of at least that amount

have been incurred."[40] During the past few years literally hundreds of bills for tax credits, deductions, and deferrals were introduced in Congress. Most of these proposals were aimed at college tuition, although the principle applies equally to concerns with private elementary and secondary education. One of the major advantages of such legislation claimed by proponents is that "increased competition from private schools will help improve public schools. The counter-argument is that tax credits would simply subsidize the withdrawal of the most vocal and concerned parents, thereby removing the strongest source of pressure for improvement in the public schools."[41]

There are several objections to such tax credits. The *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report Almanac* notes four recurring themes:

> The assistance constituted aid to religion, which is unconstitutional (most non-public schools are church-connected); it would help "white-flight academies" set up to avoid discrimination, and it would cut into support for the public schools. [Senator] Hollings also warned that the amendment was a "foot in the door" that would rapidly grow into a major drain on the federal budget.[42]

An additional concern is that the effects of such a policy would unfairly benefit only the upper middle class. Marsha Jacobs of the Department of Education outlined the opposing arguments:

> Opponents have charged that tax credits would benefit the traditionally Northern, white, and wealthy private school population. Proponents challenge this characterization, claiming that the mix of private school students has changed in recent years, and that tax credits would expand private school opportunities for minorities and the poor, providing significant benefits to families of all regions of the U.S. .[43]

The results of the data provided by the *1978 Supplement to the Current Population Survey* support the concerns of the opponents of tax credits. There are certain modifications which would more equitably balance the benefits among tax groups. Jacobs enumerates several such changes:

> If benefits are to be targeted more heavily on the disadvantaged, provisions must be designed specifically for this purpose. For example, a "refundability" provision, allowing a family whose tax liability is lower than the credit to receive a refund is necessary if low-income families are to benefit. (The Packwood-Moynihan proposal, and the estimates presented here, included such a provision.) Excluding families above a certain income level would avoid tax expenditures to the wealthiest families. Still another possible targeting approach would be to design a graduated scale of credits based on the ratio of private school expenses to family income.[44]

Vouchers

A comprehensive voucher system would provide parents and children with a certificate redeemable at any school to cover full tuition for each enrolled child. Professor John Coons, of The University of California at Berkeley law school, provides the details of one such plan:

> All taxes would come from the state level. The use of the local property tax for schools would be eliminated, making the school portion of that tax available for other municipal services if local voters so decided. The new schools would generate income by attracting families, each of whom would be entitled to a state certificate redeemable for the full cost of education; its value would be set at 90% of the amount spent upon a similar child in a similar public school. Thus, if the state spent $2,000 on a normal fifth-grader in public school in an urban area, a similar child in a new school in the same area would receive a certificate worth $1,800.[45]

This is but one representative example of numerous kinds of voucher proposals. They were first proposed in the late 1960s as a method of providing minority families with alternatives to the disintegrating public school network. "Now a decade later—despite the virulent opposition of teacher unions and the abortive federally sponsored experiment at Alum Rock, California—they have broad appeal to those who have grown increasingly disillusioned with the present system of public education."[46] An excellent recent book on this subject is Coons's and Sugarman's *Education by Choice: The Case for Family Control* published by the University of California Press in 1978.

There are several advantages claimed by proponents of such programs. First, family choice of educational institutions is greatly enhanced. By removing the cost barrier to private education, a better match of student needs, parental desire, and specialized schools can be made. Second, families will become more involved in basic education decisions affecting their future. Third, reliance on the inequitable property tax as the basis of district support for education would be eliminated. Finally, vouchers could save money, as John Coons explains:

> Since certificates for the new schools are set at 90% of the cost in public schools, every shift from a public school would represent a saving for the state. Nor should this 10% reduction reduce the quality of education provided; freed of the most oppressive aspects of the education code, the new schools would be able to operate more efficiently. More important, perhaps, since the system would put schools into competition for clientele, there would for the first time be an incentive for the public system itself to economize. Those schools unable to attract students would simply cease to operate. At last unwanted public institutions would have the decency to die.[47]

Opponents of such a radical departure from current practices cite several potential disadvantages of such a program. First, there is an absence of experimental data on the impact of voucher plans. With the exception of a pilot project in Alum Rock, California, notes Donald Erickson of the University of San Francisco, "attempts to obtain the evidence through experimentation have largely been thwarted in the U.S. For example, not one full-blown voucher experiment, however limited in locale, has ever been staged in the U.S."[48] Second, the proliferation of new schools could ruin the public school network and drive it out of business. Third, new private institutions may not be educationally sound or they could rapidly become enclaves of religious or racial segregation. Finally, to the extent that religious schools would receive aid, the First Amendment separation of church and state would be violated.

The voucher system proposed by Coons and Sugarman has safeguards which would protect against some of these potential disadvantages. In addition, certificates could be fine-tuned to adjust for special needs:

> The legislature is also encouraged to make the certificates differ in amount according to the needs of special groups of children—the handicapped, the bilingual, those choosing a vocational curriculum, and so forth. Thus a school enrolling a significant number of children with special needs could be financially advantaged. The school could not charge the family extra tuition in any form. However, the legislature could permit differences in spending so long as the right of every child to enroll in any school remains unaffected by his family's capacity to purchase education. Thus no child could be excluded from any opportunity because of family poverty, but various kinds of additional scholarships could be issued if the legislature saw fit.[49]

If this resolution is adopted for debate in 1981-82, a thorough familiarity with the policy implications of vouchers will be necessary.

Conclusion

The problematic funding of elementary and secondary education at necessary support levels is one of the major issues of the 1980s. Concern for educational equality of opportunity will clash with the taxpayer's desire for reduced expenditures. As enrollments decline, the public support enjoyed by schools also may decline. The issue of aid to private and religious institutions will further divide education interest groups.

Virtually every special interest group involved with education can legitimately claim underfunding: teacher and support personnel need cost of living raises; schools need new equipment and building renova-

tion; programs for the mentally gifted and handicapped need resources; transportation costs are increasing beyond the level of a school's ability to pay. The outlook for government resource allocation to education may well depend on the unity of these competing forces in a viable education coalition.

4 Teacher Certification Resolution

Resolved: That the Federal Government Should Establish National Standards for the Certification of Elementary and Secondary Teachers

Basic Concepts

While this area is not likely to be selected as the final resolution, many of the concepts discussed in this chapter can be applied to the minimum standards resolution. Teachers should be competent in the subjects they teach and possess basic reading, writing, and computational skills. It is not only reasonable to assume this, but also, empirical studies have confirmed that proficiency in basic subjects is necessary for effective teaching.[1] Certainly, concern for the basic competency of high school graduates is also linked to a growing concern for setting standards to insure the quality of teaching which influences these graduates. As Rutgers law professor Paul Tractenberg concluded: "You can't have effective schools and consistently strong pupil achievement without effective instruction, and that means effective, competent teachers."[2]

There are several dimensions to the problem of competent teaching. Initially, it is feared that many instructors lack basic educational skills. For example, the well-publicized results of a test on an admittedly nonrepresentative sample of 535 first-year teachers in Dallas showed over half of them failing. In Houston, half of its teacher applicants scored lower in math achievement than the average junior in high school, and almost a third were deficient in use of the English language.[3]

In addition to this general malaise, a variety of specific academic areas require significant upgrading of teacher knowledge. The President's Commission of Foreign Languages and International Studies has recommended a series of reforms to upgrade the quality of foreign language instruction. Among these are: development of new teaching materials, establishment of a national proficiency standard, and funding of twenty regional centers. These would increase the competency of teachers by designing innovative teaching strategies and methods.[4] Another area which is often mentioned as needing increased teacher

training is computer science. Currently, only four states officially certify teachers in this fast-growing subject. There are a host of problems associated with meaningful reforms including the following factors:

> Training and experience requirements for teaching computer-related courses are generally lacking. Many educators know very little about the potential for computer applications in the classroom. Teacher training programs and courses are few and far between. Computers seem to have a low priority in relation to other areas. This, coupled with the lack of incentives for teachers to learn about computers, points to the need for greater administrative commitment and recognition.[5]

Yet another problem arises among the teachers of nutrition education courses. A survey in New Jersey revealed many never had a college course in that subject:

> The data on the limited educational background and the practices of many of the teachers who include nutrition in their courses suggest the need for some inservice training for teachers involved in nutrition education. Responses on the questionnaires indicated that teachers often rely as sources for nutrition information on articles in popular magazines and books written by nonprofessionals. They need to learn how to evaluate the mass of information written about nutrition so that they can teach their students to do the same.[6]

A final example is provided from data gathered in a survey of Indiana's secondary school family-living educators. This study strongly suggests that a high percentage of instructors recently teaching family living do not meet Indiana's new minimum certification requirements.[7]

Virtually any recognized academic subject taught in elementary and secondary schools could be criticized in a similar manner. The battle is not so much over the question of a need to upgrade teacher skills but rather focuses on the method for achieving the desired result. Suggestions range from imposing standardized competency-based teacher exams on new and continuing instructors to mandatory lifelong continuing education. The most frequently cited mechanism for enacting these proposals would entail a modification of current state teacher certification requirements. The remainder of this chapter will examine these proposed solutions and their impact on the educational process.

Testing

A recent Gallup Poll on the topic of education revealed that an overwhelming number of parents (85%) agreed that passing a state board examination should be a requirement for teacher certification. The same percentage felt that teachers should also be tested every few years to insure that they are aware of new developments in their field.[8]

Walter Hathaway, an evaluation specialist for the Portland Public Schools, notes that such concerns are not new to education:

> Similar practices were common in China 5,000 years ago and in America before the Civil War. However, the current push for standards is remarkable in two respects: first, the haste with which many people have become convinced of an epidemic of incompetence among teachers; and second, the rush to use tests to solve the problem.[9]

Politicians are responding to meet the needs expressed by concerned parents. At least 15 states require some form of teacher competency testing before certification is granted, and six other states are considering similar legislation. Of those states that have mandatory testing procedures, six require passage of the National Teacher Examination (NTE)—Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and West Virginia. Provisions of testing statutes vary from state to state, even among those who require the NTE.[10]

There is strong and ongoing debate, even among education interest groups, on the value of such tests. Jack Bloomfield, examiner in charge of research and development of the New York City Board of Examiners, states the reasons favoring examination:

> . . . we cannot afford to allow inadequately trained beginning teachers to learn to teach at children's expense. The students in our urban schools are increasingly underprivileged economically and socially. They should have the most highly qualified teachers available.
>
> School systems should use the most advanced techniques for staff selection. Their assessment of potential teachers should be based on thorough, unbiased job analysis and should provide equal employment opportunity along with a strong due process component. We must screen out those applicants who are not able to communicate orally or in writing with clarity and correctness. Since all colleges do not have the same standards, additional evaluation of content and teaching mastery must be required by school systems for teaching licenses.[11]

Clearly something must be done. Reliance on current procedures alone will not remedy the problem since incompetent teachers continue to be hired and retained. Walter Hathaway supplies several reasons which support this conclusion:

> (1) At least some of those attracted to the teaching profession and to schools of education are of low or marginal ability; (2) the standards for gaining admission to and graduation from even accredited teacher preparation institutions are sometimes too low or too poorly applied to weed out incompetents; (3) state certification and district selection processes also sometimes fail to identify the incompetents and keep them out of the classroom; and (4) some teacher evalua-

> tion procedures seem inadequate for identifying incompetent teachers and removing them from the classroom, even during their probationary period and certainly not once they have tenure.[12]

Tests, with the assumption that they supply clear and objective evaluation data, are perceived as one of the few methods of shattering this closed system. However, standardized teacher examinations have many unanswered questions surrounding their use.

What Skills Are Tested?

The major issue facing proponents of teacher testing is demonstrating the validity and reliability of such exams. Validity refers to the ability of a measuring instrument to accurately reflect a positive causal relationship between mastery of the measured competencies and effective teaching. If such a set of skills is accurately identified as affecting actual teaching, then objectives can be formulated for teacher education and certification programs. Reliability refers to the question of whether repeated tests would yield consistent or similar results.

The standard for validation of competency testing is provided by Professor Homer Coker of West Georgia College:

> Validation of a competence requires not only that the competence be operationally defined but that evidence be produced to show that teachers who possess it are (on the average) more effective in helping pupils learn than teachers who do not. Ideally, evidence should be presented that there is a cause-and-effect relationship between mastery of the competence and effectiveness in the classroom. Evidence that the two are correlated is minimal proof of validity. Even such minimal evidence is rarely produced.[13]

Unfortunately, there is little agreement on which behavioral manifestations are related to effective teaching. The severe limitation this places on the predictive value of such competency-based teacher exams (CBTE) is explained by David Seeley:

> The main problem is that no one has come up with a test that can predict who will make a good teacher—or good principal, for that matter . . . At the moment, the most that tests can be expected to do is screen out those whose general educational background is too weak, or those teachers who don't know their subject matter well enough to teach it. Once you get beyond these minimal uses of tests, there is no escape from the need for human judgment followed by very careful monitoring of performance.[14]

An in-depth review of the research on teacher education concludes that even if the test is restricted to subject matter competence, basic skills, and common theories of teaching methods, validity is still poor.

Del Schalock observed: "Without exception, . . . scores derived through the National Teacher Examination and performance as a teacher . . . [were] found to be unrelated."[15] Reliability of certain exams which require observer rating of in-class performance is also suspect. Professor Coker explains:

> All, or virtually all, the competence measures used in current competency-based teacher education programs (e.g., University of Houston) or in certification programs (e.g., the pioneering Georgia State Department of Education Program) depend on judgments by trained observers recorded in the form of ratings. There are no "objective" records of the behaviors observed. Evidence that the judgments reflect the behaviors accurately, so that a high rating may be taken as a dependable indicator that an individual possesses a specific competence, is rarely or never presented. It appears that all we can be sure of is that the teachers graduated or certified are competent to make a favorable impression on a rater.[16]

There are two problems with continued reliance on such ambiguous exams. First, skills that constitute a competent teacher can shift from year to year. Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) notes his concern at this prospect:

> Since there is no research to tell us which competencies are to be required, they could change from year to year depending on the political wishes and financial circumstances of the states and local school boards. What all of this ignores is the complexity of factors that contribute to student growth. It also ignores the need for teaching to be viewed as a process involving abilities of diagnosis, analysis and understanding, as well as the performance of isolated skills.[17]

A second problem is the risk that invalid tests might actually lead to the hiring of poor teachers:

> In the virtual absence of evidence of validity of these competence measures, implementation of CBTE and teacher certification programs may well do more harm than good. It is at least possible that CBTE programs may be training students to be sycophants rather than skilled practitioners, that the certification programs may be rejecting as many competent teachers as incompetent ones—maybe more!
> In brief, neglect of the validity problem may nullify the potentially beneficient effects of competency-based teacher education and certification; in fact, these new measures could actually be counterproductive.[18]

An additional general concern is whether these tests should be required for both new and continuing teachers.

Who Is Tested?

If agreement is reached on the advisability of testing for competence, there is the unanswered question of whether continuing instructors should be required to periodically pass such exams. Shanker of the AFT argues that, as professionals, new teachers should be licensed, but that veterans should be exempted. He reasons that: "Many state and local school districts have welcomed the current focus on accountability because it gives them grounds for criticizing or even firing teachers—particularly the more expensive ones."[19] This position on testing of continuing teachers is supported by virtually every union, a development which is not surprising since the members of these unions are all established teachers. An editorial in the *Washington Post* presents the opposing view:

> Something must be done now before children are made mental cripples. [The] Superintendent is considering a requirement to have new teachers pass a test of academic skills. . . . It is no less important to be testing senior teachers. . . . Testing of old teachers as well as new ones is the way for the school system to get to the heart of its academic woes.[20]

Robert Cole, *Phi Delta Kappan* editor, argues that testing should not be required of even new teachers. The time for such an examination is during the teacher's training in college, not after graduation.

> . . . competency testing is nothing more than a search for victims, off on a false scent. The time for assurances of competence is at the beginning of the [teacher] educative process, not simply as a belated quality check at the end. It is within our power as a professional community, for example, to redesign teacher training in a way that takes advantage of valuable research findings. It is within our power to change traditional reward systems so as to attract a higher quality of teachers. Rational planning based on solid research and clear goals can effect constructive change. Hastily conceived tests of minimum competence will only add to existing confusion.[21]

Many of these concepts will be explored later in this chapter. One additional factor on the educational scene deserves mention. The public believes by a large percentage (85%) that school administrators should also be tested periodically to demonstrate ongoing knowledge of their field.[22] It seems that no one involved in the process of elementary and secondary education is exempt from scrutiny. Several examples of teacher accountability programs will now be explored.

Models

Two separate considerations are involved with determining a teacher's capability. Both knowledge of the content matter taught and familiar-

ity with teaching methods are subject to testing. Georgia began a new program requiring new teachers to demonstrate various content and teacher competencies. "After passing a criterion referenced test and graduating from an approved teacher education program, all beginning teachers receive a three-year nonrenewable certificate. During the term of the certificate they must satisfactorily demonstrate 14 performance competencies in two consecutive assessments, one in the fall and the second in the spring."[23] Louisiana has required that new teachers pass the National Teacher Examinations as a condition of certification. "Applicant failure rates on the various forms of state examinations have ranged from 20 percent in Georgia to 47 percent in Louisiana. Some who failed the tests may have moved to states that do not have such requirements and are now teaching there."[24]

Local school districts are also developing their own evaluation procedures. The extent of this proliferation of testing is revealed in a survey by the New York School Personnel Assessment Council of 64 large city school systems. Over 30% of the 54 respondents indicated that they gave examinations as part of teacher selection. Specific examples of such procedures include:

> Since August 1976, Pinellas County, Florida, has used below-criterion score performance on tests as a sufficient reason to disqualify teacher applicants from further consideration. Approximately 30% of the applicants fail the test when it is first given each year.
>
> In the Prince George's County, Maryland, School District, the teachers union was involved in efforts to keep incompetents out of the classroom. As a result, pre-employment tests began in June 1975 in the areas of spelling and grammar, and a mathematics test was added in 1977. The tests have screened out approximately 20 percent of the applicants.
>
> In Montgomery County, Maryland, prospective English teachers must obtain a score of at least 80 on a test designed for college students. In Richmond, Virginia, all elementary teachers were required to pass a course in reading before they could get pay increases.
>
> The Salem, Oregon, school system has reaped considerable political capital with their local community and much favorable attention among citizens statewide by requiring teacher candidates to get at least 23 out of 44 items correct on a locally developed test of competence in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, word usage, sentence construction, and the ability to detect student errors in composition. This program eliminates about 5 percent of the candidates from further consideration when their scores fall below criterion level.
>
> As with Pinellas County, there is evidence in Salem that the existence of the test as part of the hiring procedure is causing some candidates to apply elsewhere.[25]

It is this circumvention of state and local competency testing through applicant movement to another district which is often used to justify the need for federal involvement in the certification process.

Teacher Education

A common precondition for state certification is a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university. It is usually stipulated that the degree must be awarded from a school of education. A survey of 438 institutions with teacher training programs revealed that 217,000 people completed requirements for becoming elementary or secondary school teachers in 1977–78. The following year saw over 4,000 fewer B.A.-prepared teachers. Unfortunately, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) fewer than half of these graduates will find employment as teachers.[26] The general market is expected to remain poor for most new teachers through the mid-1980s. However, there are severe shortages in certain subject areas according to new studies by the National Education Association (NEA) and the University of Missouri. Teacher shortages in math, the physical and biological sciences, agriculture, and vocational-industrial education, as well as low supplies of teachers in music and in physical education were revealed by the NEA study. Oversupplies continued in the social studies, art, and elementary regular instruction.[27] Research by the NCES forecasts a brighter future for elementary teachers:

> . . . the downward trend in elementary school enrollments will halt at about 26.5 million by 1983 and gradually advance to nearly 29 million by 1988. The research forecasts that by that year the supply of new teacher graduates will meet only about 80 percent of the demand. Very likely most of the openings will be at the elementary level, since the new increase in student enrollment will hit there first.[28]

The current distribution of employed teachers is provided in Table 11.

Table 11

Number of Full-Time and Part-Time[1] Classroom Teachers in Public and Nonpublic Elementary and Secondary Schools, by State: Fall 1978 and Fall 1979

State or Other Area	Fall 1978			Fall 1979[2]		
	Total	Public	Nonpublic	Total	Public	Nonpublic
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
United States	2,460,000	[3]2,199,000	261,000	2,438,000	2,170,000	268,000
Alabama	44,271	40,771	3,500	43,800	40,200	3,600
Alaska	5,357	5,057	300	5,300	5,000	300
Arizona	27,754	25,654	2,100	27,500	25,300	2,200
Arkansas	24,212	23,112	1,100	23,900	22,800	1,100
California	230,100	[4]207,000	23,100	228,200	204,300	23,900
Colorado	31,961	29,461	2,500	31,700	29,100	2,600
Connecticut	41,239	35,739	5,500	40,900	35,300	5,600
Delaware	7,214	6,014	1,200	7,100	5,900	1,200
District of Columbia	7,464	5,964	1,500	7,400	5,900	1,500
Florida	83,053	71,853	11,200	82,400	70,900	11,500
Georgia	58,214	[3]53,214	5,000	57,600	52,500	5,100
Hawaii	9,840	7,940	1,900	9,800	7,800	2,000
Idaho	10,230	9,830	400	10,100	9,700	400
Illinois	129,204	112,904	16,300	128,100	111,400	16,700
Indiana	58,857	53,657	5,200	58,200	52,900	5,300
Iowa	36,611	33,511	3,100	36,300	33,100	3,200
Kansas	28,512	26,812	1,700	28,100	26,400	1,700
Kentucky	36,335	32,835	3,500	36,000	32,400	3,600
Louisiana	49,256	41,756	7,500	48,900	41,200	7,700
Maine	15,078	13,878	1,200	14,900	13,700	1,200
Maryland	48,943	42,543	6,400	48,600	42,000	6,600
Massachusetts	67,738	59,138	8,600	67,100	58,300	8,800
Michigan	97,322	87,622	9,700	96,500	86,500	10,000
Minnesota	49,088	44,488	4,600	48,600	43,900	4,700
Mississippi	28,485	25,685	2,800	28,200	25,300	2,900
Missouri	55,600	48,800	6,800	55,200	48,200	7,000
Montana	10,182	9,682	500	10,100	9,600	500
Nebraska	19,931	17,731	2,200	19,800	17,500	2,300
Nevada	6,594	6,294	300	6,500	6,200	300
New Hampshire	10,274	8,874	1,400	10,200	8,800	1,400
New Jersey	89,700	[3]78,000	11,700	89,000	77,000	12,000
New Mexico	14,909	13,909	1,000	14,700	13,700	1,000
New York	188,946	[3]158,146	30,800	187,800	156,000	31,800
North Carolina	59,009	55,309	3,700	58,400	54,600	3,800
North Dakota	7,981	7,381	600	7,900	7,300	600
Ohio	114,645	102,645	12,000	113,600	101,300	12,300
Oklahoma	33,236	32,136	1,100	32,800	31,700	1,100
Oregon	25,979	24,579	1,400	25,700	24,300	1,400
Pennsylvania	131,633	110,833	20,800	130,900	109,400	21,500
Rhode Island	10,814	9,314	1,500	10,700	9,200	1,500
South Carolina	33,122	30,022	3,100	32,800	29,600	3,200
South Dakota	9,279	8,179	1,100	9,200	8,100	1,100
Tennessee	45,420	41,220	4,200	45,000	40,700	4,300
Texas	163,713	154,913	8,800	161,900	152,900	9,000
Utah	13,535	13,235	300	[3]13,400	13,100	300
Vermont	7,180	6,480	700	7,100	6,400	700
Virginia	61,539	56,739	4,800	60,900	56,000	4,900
Washington	37,993	34,893	3,100	37,600	34,400	3,200
West Virginia	20,465	19,765	700	20,200	19,500	700
Wisconsin	55,877	47,677	8,200	55,400	47,000	8,400
Wyoming	6,106	5,806	300	6,000	5,700	300
Outlying areas:						
Puerto Rico	32,048	29,278	2,770	31,700	28,900	2,800
Virgin Islands	1,660	1,470	190	1,640	1,450	190

[1]Part-time teachers are included in totals in full-time equivalents.

[2]Estimated.

[3]Includes an estimate for the nonreporting state.

[4]Data are for fall 1977 instead of fall 1978.

[5]Estimated by the reporting state.

Sources: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, *Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, Fall 1978;* and estimates of the National Center for Education Statistics.

From: *Digest of Education Statistics,* 1980.

The current surplus of teachers built up over the past years is staggering. W. Timothy Weaver of Boston University notes this sad fact:

> Since 1970 the public schools have generally been oversupplied with new teacher graduates and since the mid-1970s have been oversupplied in every specialty. Fewer than one-half of the new teacher graduates are being placed in teaching jobs. Depending upon what assumptions one uses, the teacher surplus from 1969 to 1975 approaches half a million. The graduates who do not find teaching jobs show higher rates of unemployment and underemployment than graduates as a whole.[29]

Projections as to future needs for teachers are contained in Table 12.

Table 12

Estimated Supply of New Teacher Graduates Compared to Estimated Total Demand for Additional Teachers in Regular Elementary/Secondary Schools: Fall 1967 to Fall 1988

Fall of Year	Estimated Supply of New Teacher Graduates	Estimated Total Demand for Additional Teachers	Supply of New Teacher Graduates as a Percent of Total Demand for Additional Teachers
	(numbers in thousands)		
1967	220	223	98.7
1968	233	243	95.9
1969	264	253	104.3
1970	284	208	136.5
1971	314	163	192.6
1972	317	187	169.5
1973	313	179	174.9
1969-1973	**1,492**	**990**	**150.7**
1974	279	175	159.4
1975	238	185	128.6
1976	227	152	149.3
1977	198	168	117.9
1978	190	139	136.7
1974-1978	**1,132**	**819**	**138.2**
1979	184	125	147.2
1980	183	122	150.0
1981	178	117	152.1
1982	177	113	156.6
1983	171	145	117.9
1979-1983	**893**	**622**	**143.6**
1984	166	152	109.2
1985	159	165	96.4
1986	156	177	88.1
1987	150	182	82.4
1988	149	185	80.5
1984-1988	**780**	**861**	**90.6**

Note: Details may not add to totals because of rounding and figures for past years may differ slightly from previously published figures.

Source: National Education Association, *Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools*, 1973, 1976, 1977, and 1978, and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. National Center for Education Statistics, Projections of Education Statistics to 1988-89, 1980.

From: *The Condition of Education*, 1980.

This scarcity of jobs has led many promising college students to select majors other than education. Thus, schools of education are faced with a steadily declining pool of applicants.

> By the mid-70s, the trends of decreasing enrollment and oversupply of teachers met head-on, and the job market for teachers began to collapse. By 1979 the supply of newly graduated teachers was estimated at 147 percent of the demand, as compared with 104.3 percent in 1969. In response to the declining elementary and secondary school enrollment and the teacher surplus there was a decline in teacher college applications from a high of 313,000 (174.9 percent of demand) in 1973 to 184,000 in 1979 (147 percent of demand).[30]

Other evidence supports this conclusion. A study by David Clark and Egon Guba suggests a continued decline in teacher education enrollments. Late in 1978, the U.S. Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook* reported a six-year drop-off of nearly 9 percent in teacher education enrollments.[31]

Schools of Education

There are over 1,400 institutions that offer programs in education. About 40% are small private senior colleges, the remaining are a mixture of private universities, new state teacher colleges, and independent schools. "These schools, like the senior colleges, are neither associated in a single organization nor accountable to any common agency for the quality of their product. Only the state in which they reside has jurisdiction over their programs."[32] This nonsystem of loose guidelines creates a vacuum which state and federal governments will fill with regulations. "More and more, the tendency is for state and federal legislatures to lay down directions, policies, programs, and even curricular content, which in turn are interpreted and transformed into regulations by bureaucratic agencies. They are staffed with persons who know little about pedagogical education and whose experience in it is even less."[33]

The major problem which government seeks to control is the dramatic decrease in the quality of the students seeking careers as teachers. A representative sample of evidence of this concern is expressed by Cooke and Moss:

> College entrance exam scores for prospective teachers are far below the national mean, and increasing numbers of college freshmen in teacher training programs are taking remedial courses in writing and math to meet minimal skill levels.
>
> Teacher's college admission standards and program requirements have been lowered to meet the level of incoming freshmen.[34]

Schools have accepted these academically marginal students in an attempt to keep their education departments from folding. T. Edward Hollander, chancellor of New Jersey's Department of Higher Education, substantiates this claim:

> These programs have supported their tenured faculties by accepting students who are not as well qualified as they should be, and by drawing on the resources generated by strong enrollments in other areas. The time has come for us to close the door to these programs for those who are not among the best of their classes. The future of our children is too important to allow anyone but those with the most potential to become teachers.[5]

It is obvious that current admissions policies allow just about everyone who applies to enter teacher preparatory programs. Harold A. Brubaker reported that in 1976 most institutions rejected fewer than 10% of their applicants. Obviously, admissions standards are largely inoperative, if not mythical.[36]

In addition, teacher education programs are severely underfunded. Less money is spent per capita for educating college students who plan on becoming teachers than is allocated to educate the average high school student. A survey by Peseau and Orr of twenty universities in 1978 revealed significant gaps in funding teacher preparation programs.

> Our study of 20 universities in 1978 revealed that most states follow the Texas example. That is, they view teacher education programs as less complex than other university programs for funding purposes. Moreover, teacher education programs tend to receive a smaller proportion of the dollars they produce in student credit hours than do other programs. In the nine universities that supplied complete financial data, four teacher education programs were underfunded by 40% or more according to the dollars these programs produced. All nine teacher education programs were underfunded by anywhere from 12% to 62%.[37]

Reforms

Declining job markets, reduced enrollments, and lower-quality students have backed schools of education into a corner. While many see the answer to these problems in terms of competency testing of graduating college seniors or new teachers, other alternatives are available. Of course, there are numerous barriers to effective reform of teacher education. B. Othanel Smith of the University of South Florida notes several of these impediments:

> fear of losing a tenured job if enrollments decrease
> divergent philosophical beliefs toward education make fundamental

change unlikely
non-job-related course proliferation
lack of clinical training for teachers
too general an approach to course content for teacher training
poorly informed legislators generate policy
allocation of resources based on Full Time Enrolled Students, not curricular needs.[38]

The costs associated with certain changes in curriculum or shifts in program emphasis will be difficult for many schools of education to meet. Karl Massanari, associate director of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), explains a common plight:

> The education degree program, along with social work, is often at the bottom of the priority list for a university's administration. In contrast to programs like the sciences that require costly laboratory instruction, education represents low-cost instruction. Revenue brought in by teacher education program enrollments is often used to subsidize other programs. In the past, universities depended on the heavy enrollments of the schools of education; however, with decreased enrollments, teacher education programs have low credibility and even less support, prestige and money.[39]

Therefore, either government funds must be allocated to support anticipated reforms, or universities must be required to supply needed monies.

One adjustment which may help schools recruit better students would entail broadening the career focus of education to include not only teaching in a traditional school setting but also teaching in business and government. Professor Weaver believes that:

> The broadened mission [of schools of education] would recognize the learning needs in business, industry, government, medicine and mental health, and the military. The strategy I am suggesting is not to abandon the responsibility to the public schools but to balance the tendency to focus on that limited sphere of educational activities as the whole of education. . . . There are a number of examples of professional preparation, training, and research needs in the "nonschool" education sector.[40]

Another change which is anticipated involves mandating an additional year of education for college students enrolled in education degree programs. This fifth year is envisioned as an apprenticeship or internship opportunity for students to acquire practice in teaching and to receive feedback on their performance.

A third reform would necessitate a dramatic restructuring of current schools of education. Selective admissions policies would be coupled

with a reduced student-faculty ratio to increase the quality of graduates. This should "result in the graduation of much more competent teachers. A statewide quota system could be developed to prevent unnecessary program growth as well as facilitate a stabilization of teacher supply and demand. The principal reason for allowing 'open' admissions to teacher preparatory programs would, therefore, be eliminated."[41]

A fourth reform would be to upgrade certification for teachers in content areas as well as in general teaching methods. This would encourage appropriate specialization during undergraduate degree work which would, it is hoped, provide a rigorous course of study. A final change would hold the degree-granting institution responsible for the quality of the teachers it produced. Currently, schools are accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). This organization develops standards and goals for recognized teacher education programs. Lately, "the council's approach has been more regulatory. The percentage of institutions denied accreditation of one or more programs has risen to as high as 31% in recent months. Accreditation has been denied not only to small liberal arts colleges but to large private and state institutions, land-grant universities, and regional state institutions as well."[42] Strengthening these standards by operationally defining expected behavior and developing procedures for evaluating the performance of graduates of accredited schools would increase pressure on universities to produce quality teachers.

Inservice Education

If schools of education are unable to ensure that students who graduate from their institutions are competent teachers, the elementary and secondary schools that hire their graduates must provide such training. Val Rust, from the department of education at the University of California in Los Angeles, believes that this assumption of further training is built into preservice or university degree programs. "From its inception, American teacher training has included the assumption that teachers would continually improve themselves through further education. It has been taken for granted that teacher improvement would lead to better schools; traditionally, for example, teachers have taken for granted that they must enroll in evening and summer courses."[43] Not content with this implicit promise of an ongoing upgrading of skills, many states are considering proposals for mandatory continuing education.

> At present, some form of continuing or inservice education for teachers is required or is under consideration in at least 28 states.

> Many others, such as New Jersey, Oklahoma, Utah, Vermont, and Virginia, permit local districts to set continuing education policy. And in Wisconsin lifetime licensing of new teachers will end in 1983 and licenses based on a required program of continuing education will have to be renewed every five years.[44]

Proponents of continuing education believe that teachers must be forced to keep current with new developments in their fields to meet the demands of parents for competent instructors. The Supreme Court in the case of *Harrah Independent School District* v. *Mary Jane Martin* (1979) upheld the right of school boards not to renew contracts of tenured public school teachers who refuse to satisfy continuing education requirements.[45] The diverse conditions surrounding classroom education add to the need for ongoing education. As Professor Smith notes:

> Demands upon teachers for more academic learning and pedagogical knowledge and skill multiply as diversity among pupils increases, as parental concern about the conduct of schools and the quality of teaching becomes more acute, as legal aspects of teaching become more complex, as every social malady is converted into an educational problem, as school and classroom disruptions become more severe, and as knowledge—academic and pedagogical—accumlates ever more rapidly.[46]

Implementation Problems

Despite the Supreme Court's ruling allowing states to mandate continuing education, there are several problems with this approach. First, the usual approach for ongoing training is to allow teachers to enroll in any one of a number of courses to complete a certain number of units within a set amount of time. There is no coherent pattern or structure to the sequence of courses or training sessions. "In some cases, especially for teachers, the required coursework does not even have to be related to the subject one teaches."[47]

A second issue relates to the negative incentives which exist in schools for applying these skills taught during such continuing education classes. This organizational problem is explained by Professor Rust:

> Typically, a teacher enrolls in a widely advertised university course; he or she is thrown together with strangers who are either pursuing an advanced degree or are working at other schools. The teacher then brings newly acquired skills and insights back to the established school environment with its own norms, role expectations, and relationship patterns. The latter act as natural barriers to innovative efforts by persons who wish to incorporate their inservice learning in the school program. The expectation of colleagues usual-

> ly is that the person will continue to behave as he or she did prior to engaging in inservice work, even if the changed behavior is desirable. Occasionally, individual teachers do have an impact. But organizational studies have clearly demonstrated that this is an exception.[48]

Clearly, what is required is a more systematic approach toward upgrading teacher skills.

There are other problems associated with requiring continuing education as a condition for certification. Teachers complain that many courses are irrelevant to their real needs or are poorly designed and taught. Others claim that the objectives for these courses are not developed by elementary or secondary school teachers but rather are determined by political whim. Finally, the proliferation of private, local, state, and federal training programs has led to confusion and frustration. Given these difficulties it will come as no surprise that results of education studies demonstrate no clear relationship between such programs and improved competence.[49]

One attempt to cope with this congestion is provided by P.L. 95-561. Under its provisions, states must develop "a comprehensive plan for the coordination of federal and state funds for training activities for educational personnel in the state, including preservice and inservice education, which plan shall be developed with the involvement of teachers, professional associations, institutions of higher education, and other interested individuals and organizations."[50] This law will encourage a continuation of the current emphasis in the states on developing such inservice education programs. As Peseau and Orr of the University of Alabama note: "while the language of the law calls only for 'coordination', it will result in the development of *data collection* procedures that have not existed in most states; ultimately it may provide a mechanism for major restructuring of resources supporting teacher education at both the state and federal levels."[51]

The final barrier to successful implementation of mandatory continuing education is the sheer magnitude of the number of teachers who must be enrolled and the small amount of money allocated toward these programs.

> There are over two million teachers, of whom approximately two-thirds hold only a bachelor's degree. The resources for increasing their level of performance are totally inadequate. College faculties are largely used in preservice programs and would be almost completely absorbed in that function were the programs adequately developed. Experienced teachers, however well prepared, have neither the time nor the energy to assist with inservice training functions. And it hardly need be added that teaching loads and collective bargaining contracts allow little time for teachers to exchange tricks of the trade, let alone engage in serious study.

> For another thing, colleges of pedagogy in the U.S. are now producing some 200,000 teachers per year, and within another five years may be turning out as many as they were before the slump began. In each five year period one million new teachers are added to the ranks. The output of ineffective preservice programs adds up to a stream of ill-prepared teachers greater than any inservice program can possibly cope with, even a program more extensive than anyone is ever likely to see.[52]

Teacher Centers

Teacher Centers are a recent addition to federal education programs. First introduced in 1980 with a budget of $13 million, this program, according to the NEA past president John Ryor, "did not come about accidentally. Its roots lie in the dissatisfaction of teachers with inservice programs that they—whose needs such programs are supposed to meet—have had little or no involvement in planning . . . the Teacher Center Program provides teachers a high degree of control over aspects of their own professional development"[53] An explanation of the scope of this program is provided by Peseau and Orr:

> This program provides public and nonpublic elementary and secondary school teachers with opportunities to develop training and curricular materials that meet their needs and thereby the needs of their students. It encourages state education personnel to provide leadership. Ten percent of the funds awarded to each state are allocated to the state education agency for screening applications, providing technical assistance to projects, and disseminating the results. Depending upon the amount of funds available, states have the opportunity to hire staff, use specialized consultants, sponsor meetings, etc. Since this federal program is focused upon teacher needs, opportunities for linking state activities with local teacher needs are clearly enhanced.[54]

There are some problems with this approach. As teachers become involved in self-regulation they fail to rigorously police themselves. This charge has often been leveled against other professional groups such as doctors, lawyers, and police. In addition, school administrators fear teacher control of the centers program. "A survey of public school district superintendents revealed that 57 percent foresaw problems with teacher centers because of their mandated control by classroom teachers."[55] Cooperative planning of curriculum, professional standards, and certification requirements seem best.

Legal Problems

There are several legal issues that are involved with proposals for expansion of certification.

> Aside from having to comply with all other state and federal constitutional and regulatory requirements, as well as with local laws, regulations, and contracts, teacher selection procedures must comply with the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment; any written examination must be directly related to the job of teaching. In view of the previously cited dirth of empirical evidence on the predictive validity of supposed essential teacher competencies, this validation could be difficult to establish.[56]

The equal protection clause of the Constitution and provisions of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act (EEOA) mandate that "a test must not discriminate either directly or indirectly on the basis of race, religion, national origin, or sex."[57] Law professor Trachtenberg explains the proof necessary for action under these provisions:

> Once the plaintiffs have proved that tests have the effect of disproportionately screening out minority applicants, the defendant has the burden of justifying its use of the tests. However, where plaintiffs have shown a racially disproportionate effect from use of a test, the defendants have virtually always failed to justify their reliance on test scores. In order to do so, they must prove that the tests have "validity." Although the EEOA guidelines seem to require predictive validity, they have not been applied rigorously by the agency itself, nor by the courts. In most instances . . . the tests in question have been found lacking in content validity. In other cases the defendant used the tests improperly.[58]

Recent Supreme Court rulings seem to allow teacher competency tests.

> The U.S. Supreme Court decisions which upheld the use of the National Teacher Examinations in South Carolina and the *Duke Power Company* case upholding the use of employee tests if they are related to the job at hand will all contribute to the use of teacher competency tests. Some people feel it's logical to assume the courts will uphold the use of teacher tests in reading, writing, and arithmetic since teaching these s[illegible]jects is a primary function of the school.[59]

A second major issue revolves around attempts to dismiss incompetent teachers.

> One roadblock may well be tenure laws. While tenure laws protect the rights of competent teachers and administrators, they also make attempts to dismiss incompetent teachers so controversial and time-consuming that they are all too rarely carried out. This protection strains the credibility of consumers, whose own jobs may be less secure, and who may fail to believe that the political conditions that made tenure necessary are still operating.[60]

Of course, tenure laws do not provide absolute protection for poor teachers. Unfortunately, most states do not define what the term *incompetence* means in various tenure or dismissal laws. A review of

court cases which have upheld dismissal actions have categorized sufficient cause for job termination as follows:

> *Teaching methods*, including failure to maintain classroom control, failure to adapt to current teaching techniques, physical mistreatment of pupils, and poor lesson organization.
>
> *Effects on pupils*. Courts have upheld dismissal of teachers who couldn't get along with pupils in their classes, who failed to keep self-control, who caused low moral or fear among pupils, and who related personal, financial, or sexual matters in class. Several courts also have upheld firings based on charges of low pupil achievement.
>
> *Teachers' personal attitudes*, including tardiness, refusal to teach, refusal to accept supervision, and lack of concern or courtesy. Among teachers dismissed were ones who refused to allow supervisory personnel to enter the classroom, who failed to cooperate with other teachers, and who showed lack of self-restraint and tact in dealing with co-workers, pupils, and parents.
>
> *Knowledge of subject matter*. Teachers have been dismissed for specific errors of fact in history and geography and for lack of knowledge of English grammar, spelling and punctuation.[61]

Teachers subject to dismissal hearings must be accorded a variety of due process safeguards. "Due process speaks to fairness. Some fairness 'rights' come to the fore in the supervisory process: (1) the right to know what standards of performance were expected; (2) the right to notice and feedback; (3) the right to a chance to improve and to get help for improvement; (4) the right to have sufficient time to carry out prescribed improvement."[62] Remediation programs can often work to correct deficiencies before dismissal becomes necessary. The superintendent of Salt Lake City public schools, Thomas Carpenter, reports that his district's program developed in cooperation with the local teacher's association has been successful.[63]

A final legal issue involves the imposition of state or federal standards and requirements on private schools. "In a recent case in Kentucky, the State Board of Education's capacity to regulate private schools has been significantly curtailed. The state supreme court found that state accreditation standards may not be applied to private and parochial schools in accomplishing the constitutional purpose of compulsory education . . ."[64] Another example is North Carolina, where officials recently went to court in Raleigh to demand that 11 of that state's Christian-oriented schools be required to report on available enrollment facilities, course offerings, and teacher certification.[65] This problem is likely to proliferate as the number of private schools increases. The crash between religious freedom and government education policy will be an important issue in the 1980s.

Conclusion

Federal concern for teacher certification will carve out a new area of education policymaking for the federal government. The states have become increasingly active in upgrading certification requirements, imposing competency testing, and encouraging continuing education. Those factors noted in Chapter One which justify the involvement of the national level of government in education supply the rationale for the extension of federal power over various aspects of the certification process. Laws, no matter how well intended, are no guarantee that statutory reforms will be meaningful. Certification is only one of numerous interrelated problems facing education today. As Professor Smith warns:

> Make no mistake about it, adding a course here and a course there, reshuffling academic requirements, screening candidates for admission, integrating methods courses and student teaching, or adding an internship will have little effect upon the ability of teachers to cope with demands upon them now made by the growth of knowledge, new social conditions, and a consumer-oriented public that knows what it wants only in general and abstract terms. Nothing short of thorough overhauling of pedagogical education will do.[65]

5 Getting Started

The four preceding chapters have provided information on many of the policy issues facing education today. Concerns expressed in the debate resolution are mirrored by the actions of legislators and educators alike as the decade of the '80s begins. This publication would serve as an early guide for examining the scope of the topic and for setting early research priorities. However, the burden quickly shifts to the debater, who must devise a plan for gathering additional evidence on the numerous specific arguments which will be formulated during the year. While many debaters have discovered their own ad hoc methods for accumulating evidence, a brief review of a more organized process for researching important issues may prove beneficial.

The Beginning

Just as the initial ingredient for duck soup is a duck, the first step in the research process must be to discover those areas that should be researched. A successful method often used in business and academic groups is to "brainstorm" to generate as many ideas as possible on a topic. The application of this technique to a forensic squad is relatively straightforward. Coaches and debaters should discuss what case areas and issues are likely to develop on each of the resolutions. This exchange should encourage all members of the group to volunteer information or contribute their ideas.The groups are easy to establish: (l) evaluation and criticism by group members are forbidden, (2) all contributions are to be encouraged, (3) attempt is made to create the greatest quantity of ideas, and (4) a combination of ideas and solutions is sought.[1]A list should be kept on concepts for cases, topicality arguments, and potential advantages.

This session does not have to be totally unstructured. It would probably enhance the quality of this exchange if a few general articles on current issues in education were read first. Another good strategy would be to review past high school and college topics for similarities to this year's resolution. For example, the high school topics several years ago dealt with financing of education. Also, more recently, evidence on the effectiveness of health and safety education was gathered by most teams on the consumer goods resolution. This information will once again be used if the minimum standards topic is

selected. Finally, debaters should review and update responses to those generic disadvantages which seem to be applied to every topic by some teams.

Research Procedure

Once a list of concepts has been accumulated, it becomes necessary to assign priorities to research assignments. A number of questions must be considered when making such assignments. Is it important to research an affirmative case first? What areas can be covered with the sources readily available? What cases are likely to be run early in the year? Answers to questions like these will determine which ideas will be initially considered as high research objectives.

After a priority list has been developed, the most systematic method of researching is to compile bibliographies on each of the major issues. While some debaters are very good at chasing down obscure footnotes in books and articles or intuitively finding useful publications, the best and most comprehensive method is to consult the library card catalog for books and indexes for periodicals.

Indexes and Abstracts

Most indexes and abstracts are organized by both subject headings and author's last name. Abstracts offer the additional attraction of providing a brief summary of the article or publication listed, thus helping the researcher screen out less useful entries. Typical subject headings on the education topic would include: schools, sex education, curriculum, public education, instruction, nutrition, traffic safety, bond issues, and teachers.

The most widely available index is *The Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature*. Available in most high school libraries, this work surveys over 150 popular, nontechnical magazines. There are several other indexes of a more specialized nature which are important to review on this topic. *The Public Affairs Information Service* (PAIS) includes information from government and industry sources, while the *Business Periodicals Index* contains references to business and industry journals and magazines. A standard reference work for legal journals is the *Index to Legal Periodicals*. *The Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* inventories "our government's welter of print. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government and various regulatory agencies' reports are indexed."[2]

In addition to these general resources, numerous specialized education indexes are available. Among the more useful are:

Current Index to Journals in Education
CIJE currently covers more than 700 publications which represent the core periodicals on the topic of education. Each entry is briefly annotated for added convenience. This is perhaps the best single reference source on the topic of education.

Education Index
This subject and author index of over 300 sources includes entries for periodicals, yearbooks, and monographs on a wide range of education topics. This index is required reading for the serious researcher.

Educational Administration Abstracts
Published three times a year by the University Council for Educational Administration, this reference work abstracts articles from over 130 periodicals which deal with problems facing school administrators.

Psychological Abstracts
Monthly updates containing nonevaluative summaries of world literature on psychology and other disciplines are contained in this abstracting service. The major content classifications for this topic are: communication systems, developmental psychology, social processes and social issues, and educational psychology.

Resources in Education
This monthly abstract and index contains references to often-unpublished education material which is available from Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).

Social Science Index
Quarterly updates of over 270 periodicals and journals devoted to studying major issues in the social sciences. Topic headings for this year's research would include: education, student, sex education, public schools

Many nationally distributed newspapers provide indexes to their publications. The *Christian Science Monitor*, *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Wall Street Journal* are all respected major papers with indexes available in many main libraries. Articles from many local newspapers are collected by *Newsbank* which contains a subject category for education issues.

If all of this seems confusing, there are two options available to the debater. First, there are books that explain various reference sources in greater detail. Good examples of this are *The New York Times Guide to Reference Materials*,[3] *Government Publications and Their Use*,[4] and *Guide to Reference Books*.[5] A second option is to pay to have a research service compile a bibliography on selected topics. A

sliding-scale fee is charged by groups such as ERIC for computer retrieval of information on a wide range of education issues.

Sources

While indexes and abstracts provide a systematic inventory of various magazines and journals, there is an obvious time lag between the publishing of these periodicals and their inclusion in reference works. One way to insure that a research effort remains current is to examine recent, unbound copies of the most frequently cited publications. It is always a good idea to read a copy of the local newspaper for timely information. Several of the more popular news weeklies should also be reviewed at regular intervals. *Newsweek, Time, U.S. News and World Report,* as well as *Business Week* and *Nation's Business,* are good sources of current information on issues of national concern.

Several other less familiar sources should be examined. The *Congressional Record* provides an official daily account of the debates in Congress, while the *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Reports* provides a more general overview of major issues confronting the federal government. Each summer, *Current History* devotes several issues to the high school debate topic. Another source which sometimes covers education issues is *Editorial Research Reports* which is published by Congressional Quarterly, Inc. *Facts on File* also has a section on current issues in education.

In addition to these publications there are many works that are devoted mainly to the topic of education. A representative sample would include:

American Education
This publication "reflects the federal interest in education at all levels" and is published ten times a year by the federal Department of Education.

Curriculum Review
Published five times a year by the Curriculum Advisory Service, this work evaluates textbooks and curriculum developments for grades K–12.

Day Care and Early Education
Published quarterly, this magazine carries a variety of articles on preschool and early childhood education.

Education
This quarterly publication contains scholarly studies and papers on innovations in education.

The Education Digest
Published monthly, September through May, this periodical presents digests of articles from other education-related publica-

tions. A wide range of current issues is covered. For researchers with limited access to other sources, a thorough review of this digest is essential.

Educational Horizons
This quarterly publication of Pi Lambda Theta contains articles organized around central themes representing current issues facing educators.

Educational Leadership
This is the official journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Published monthly, October through May, this journal contains valuable articles on such topics as testing, certification, curriculum, and instructional development.

Educational Researcher
Published eleven times a year by the American Educational Research Association, this source contains articles providing research results and social science data on education topics.

Health Education Quarterly
This official publication of the Society for Public Health Education often contains journal articles on the practice and evaluation of health education programs.

Human Rights
This quarterly journal is published by the ABA Press for the Section on Individual Rights and Responsibilities of the American Bar Association and often contains articles on various legal issues which have an impact on the educational process.

Journal of Nutrition Education
This quarterly publication of the Society for Nutrition Education contains useful articles on this subject area.

Journal of School Health
Published ten times a year, this journal is a valuable aid for research on topics such as screening programs, health education, sex education, and immunization programs.

Phi Delta Kappan
Published monthly, September through June, this source is a must for research on this year's topics. Virtually every issue has timely information on a variety of important subjects.

Primary Data

Most judges of debate, whether at the high school or college level, would concede that most debaters know very little about empirical methodology. However, to effectively argue this year's topic, a basic understanding of the concepts and terminology of scientific research will be required. For example, concepts such as *criterion-referenced* and *norm-referenced* are involved with the issue of standardized testing of student and teacher abilities. Also, the effectiveness of

specific educational programs is determined through empirical evaluation. The validity and reliability of measuring instruments used in such evaluation is critical to the acceptance of claimed results. Yet another example centers on the use of survey research. Data from Gallup and other sources are used to justify projections and decisions made by education policymakers.

One reference work which contains a glossary of many terms used in testing is the *Information Please Almanac, 1981.*[6] Other sources of information would include chapters on empirical research in debate text books or basic texts on scientific methods used in lower division college courses. Statistical information on education is contained in several reference works, including the *Statistical Abstract*. Some of the more frequently cited resources are:

The Book of the States
Published at two-year intervals by the Council of State Governments, this work includes information and statistics on the current status of education in the states.

The Condition of Education
This annual statistical report is prepared by the National Center for Educational Statistics. Data "on a variety of issues concerning educational institutions, participants, and personnel" are compiled. Six of the seven chapters of the 1980 edition are relevant to this year's debate topics. Each chapter has a narrative which elaborates the statistical tables and charts which follow.

Digest of Education Statistics
The 1980 edition is the eighteenth in the series of publications by the National Center for Education Statistics. Its primary purpose is to provide national, current statistical information covering the education system from preschool to graduate school. Useful information on a wide range of topics is included.

Standard Education Almanac
The 1979–80 edition is the twelfth edition of this comprehensive source of information on education in the United States. Brief articles precede the statistical tables extracted from over 60 sources on subjects such as education, elementary and secondary education, and adult and career education. This almanac is published by Marquis Who's Who, Inc. of Chicago.

Evidence Transcription

The end product of this research effort is the gathering of usable evidence to support arguments on issues raised during a debate. Actually, this statement should be refined to include the restriction that the evidence should meet the commonly agreed upon tests of evidence. Among these are: (1) expertise of the author, (2) unbiased reporting of

information, (3) timely information for the issue discussed, and (4) verifiable sources of data.

In addition, full source citation should be available for each unit of evidence used in a debate. An increasing concern of those involved with educational debate is the frequency of challenges to information introduced during debate rounds. It is the responsibility of contestants to become aware of the rules and regulations required by their league and the National Forensic League on source citations and challenges to evidence. Some debaters carry copies of important affirmative and negative sources to immediately answer requests for clarification. A caution sounded in last year's *First Analysis* deserves repeating: "Particular problems often arise when evidence is paraphrased or when seemingly irrelevant information is edited out. As a general practice, this type of editing should be avoided."[7]

An example of a file card which contains a full citation is provided in Figure 1.

Figure 1

(1)D4C

(2) Court decisions contribute to teacher testing (3) Chris Pipho, (4) Associate Director of the Research and Information Dept., Education Commission of the States, (5) *Educational Leadership*, (6) November 1980, (7) p. 127.

(8)The U.S. Supreme Court decisions which upheld the use of the National Teacher Examinations in South Carolina and the Duke Power Company case upholding the use of employee tests if they are related to the job at hand will all contribute to the use of teacher competency tests.

(9) CD 273

Figure 1. The numbers prefacing various parts of the sample card refer to the following: (1) code number of section for refiling; (2) brief synopsis of the content of the evidence; (3) author of quotation; (4) author's qualification or experience; (5) source; (6) date of publication; (7) page; (8) one central concept of evidence; (9) initials of student researcher and consecutive number of total evidence cards researched by this debater.

The process of researching a debate resolution continues through the year. A topic will experience many changes between the time this work is published and the beginning of the season in the fall. For example, President Reagan's proposed budget cuts and the reorganization of federal education grants should be determined during the sum-

mer. Professor Henderson's warning of several years ago is still a valid observation:

> Those of you beginning to debate the new topic will want to broaden your reading, consider the implications of this first analysis, and discuss the potential implications with others. A debater should never rely on a narrow base of information, whether it be a compilation of viewpoints similar to *First Analysis*, a single news source such as a news magazine, a debate quote handbook, or the coach of a debate squad. Instead, the debater must broaden her or his understanding of the political context within which the subject is being debated, and then exhibit that understanding to the reasonable, prudent, thinking individual who serves as judge for the debate.[4]

Education is one of the most important functions performed by society. To adequately prepare the next generation of thinkers, leaders, workers, and parents is an awesome responsibility. Issues that will be discussed on these debate resolutions will touch on the nature and quality of the educational system of the '80s. Parents and children, teachers and students, coaches and debaters are all vitally concerned with the possible solutions to the many problems associated with the future of education.

Good luck during the coming year. If this *First Analysis* provides the framework for formulating an orderly consideration of this topic, its purpose has been accomplished.

Notes

Chapter One

1. "Essentials of Education," *The Education Digest*, 45 (February 1980): 67.
2. Ralph Tyler, "The U.S. vs. the World: A Comparison of Educational Performance," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (January 1981): 307.
3. "Soviets Far Ahead in Math, Science Training," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 84.
4. Tyler, p. 310.
5. "Illiteracy Among Adults," *The Education Digest*, 45 (November 1979): 67.
6. National Center for Educational Statistics, *The Condition of Education: 1980 Edition, Part I*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1980) p. 230.
7. "Voc Ed Students Are More Employable, Says NIE," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (December 1980): 236.
8. "Carnegie Work Report," *The Education Digest*, 45 (January 1980): 62.
9. Richard A. Graham, "A Second Chance: Raising Teenagers' Employability," *The Education Digest*, 46 (December 1980): 26.
10. *Congressional Quarterly Almanac 1980*,(Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1981) p. 680.
11. "School, Congress Leaders Criticize Youth Initiative," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (May 1980): 590.
12. William Drummond and Theodore Andrews, "The Influence of Federal and State Governments on Teacher Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 67.
13. "Reagan Education Funds Plan Causes Stir," *The Sacramento Bee*, 21 February 1981, p. A3.
14. "Education Department Explains Its Structure and Purposes," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (June 1980): 670.
15. Abraham Ribicoff, "A Separate Department of Education: Why Not the Best," *Change*, 10 (February 1978): 27.
16. "Quick Victory Sought for Department of Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 60 (April 1979): 558.
17. "The Question of a U.S. Department of Education," *Congressional Digest*, 57 (November 1978): 259.
18. "Benign Neglect Again?" *The Sacramento Bee*, Editorial, 1 March 1981.
19. Ibid.
20. "Supreme Court," *The Education Digest*, 46 (December 1980): 63.

21. Arlene Patterson, "Professional Malpractice: Small Cloud, but Growing Bigger," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 62 (November 1980): 193.
22. Ellis Katz, "The State Rediscovered: Education Policymaking in the 1970s," *State Government,* 53 (Winter 1980): 31.
23. Ibid.
24. "Nearly One-Fifth of U.S. Schools Are Private: NCES," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 61 (January 1980): 308.
25. "Private School Students Are Mostly Northern, White, and Wealthy: HEW," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 61 (April 1980): 515.
26. Val Rust and Frances Reed, "Home Teaching and Herbart," *Educational Horizons,* 58 (Winter 1979): 75.
27. Ibid.
28. "Limits on Home Education," *The Education Digest,* 46 (December 1980): 69.
29. Anthony Schwaller, "The Need for Education/Training Programs in Industry," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 61 (January 1980): 322.
30. Marc Leepson, "The Big Business of Employee Education," *Editorial Research Reports,* 9 January 1981, p. 14.
31. Ibid., p. 15.
32. Douglas Ehninger and Wayne Brockriede, *Decision by Debate,* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), p. 155.
33. David L. Wagner, *ERIC First Analysis: Consumer Interests, 1980–81 National High School Debate Resolutions, (Falls Church, Va.: ERIC/RCS, 1980), p.8.*
34. Ibid., p. 21.
35. *Webster's New World Dictionary and Thesaurus of the American Language,* (1970), s.v.
36. Schwailer, p. 322.
37. *Webster's,* s.v.
38. *Words and Phrases* (1980), s.v.

Chapter Two

1. Editorial, *The Sacramento Bee,* 9 February 1981, p. B10.
2. Editorial, *The Christian Science Monitor,* 24 February 1981, p. 24.
3. "Refugee Children," *The Education Digest,* 46 (September 1980): 64.
4. National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), *The Condition of Education: 1980 Edition, Part I,* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1980), p. 47.
5. Earl Ogletree, "The Status of State-Legislated Curricula in the U.S.," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 61 (September 1979): 135.
6. Ibid.
7. NCES, p. 55.
8. "Next Japan Target: Personal Computers," *Christian Science Monitor,* 30 January 1981, p. 10.

9. Ruth Walker, "Computer Literacy: Important—But Exactly What Is It?" *Science Digest*, 88 (September 1980): 75.
10. Robert J. Seidel, "It's 1980: Do You Know Where Your Computer Is?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (March 1980): 481.
11. Walker, p. 75.
12. Ibid., p. 74.
13. Seidel, p. 481.
14. Ibid.
15. Walker, p. 77.
16. Ibid.
17. Veronica Huang Li, "Foreign Languages: Tongue-Tied Americans," *Editorial Research Reports*, 11 (19 September 1980): 682.
18. "U.S. Students Neglecting Foreign Language Study," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 60 (March 1979): 483.
19. "Multilingualism Wanted," *Education Digest*, 45 (September 1979): 67.
20. "U.S. Students Neglecting," p. 483.
21. "Foreign Language Study," *Education Digest*, 45 (December 1979): 66.
22. Steven A. Grant, "Language Policy in the United States," *ADFL Bulletin*, 9 (May 1978): 11.
23. Nick Thimmesch, "Our Shocking Illiteracy in Foreign Languages," *Reader's Digest*, 118 (February 1981): 180.
24. Richard T. Thompson, "New Directions in Foreign Language Study," *The Annals of the American Academy*, 449 (May 1980): 48.
25. Ibid., p. 54.
26. Huang Li, p. 691.
27. "Foreign Language Study," p. 68.
28. Huang Li, p. 683.
29. Ibid., p. 690.
30. "Math," *The Education Digest*, 45 (November 1979): 64.
31. NAEP, "Analyzing Changes in Student Math Achievement," *The Education Digest*, 45 (December 1979): 16.
32. Ibid., p. 18.
33. NCES, p. 5.
34. "Soviets Far Ahead in Math, Science Training," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 84.
35. Cecily Cannan Selby, "Science as 'the Fourth R'—Basic and Also Beautiful!" *Science Digest*, 88 (September 1980): 44.
36. Edward B. Fiske, "Science's Heyday in the Schools Is Past," *The Education Digest*, 45 (October 1979): 19.
37. Ibid., p. 17.
38. "Attitudes Toward Science," *The Education Digest*, 45 (February 1980): 67.
39. Fiske, p. 20.
40. "Scientific Illiteracy," *The Education Digest*, 46 (December 1980): 62.
41. NCES, p. 6.

42. Fiske, p. 20.
43. Daniel C. Witmer, "Teaching Children Bus Safety," *The Education Digest*, 45 (May 1980): 37.
44. Ibid., p. 36.
45. Peter Relic, "School Boards and Safety in School Sports," *The Education Digest*, 45 (December 1979): 33.
46. Ibid.
47. Ibid., p. 35.
48. Jane Berthold, "A New Approach to Traffic Safety Education," *Traffic Safety*, 80 (January 1980): 14–15.
49. D. Paul Sondel, "Driver Education," *Traffic Safety*, 78 (September 1978): 20.
50. Berthold, p. 15.
51. Ibid., p. 14.
52. Sondel, p. 30.
53. "Driver Education Courses," *The Education Digest*, 46 (September 1980): 68.
54. Sondel, pp. 30–31.
55. Ibid., p. 30.
56. Ibid., p. 20.
57. Lew Collins and Clay Moore, "Does Motorcycle Safety Education Really Work?" *Traffic Safety*, 80 (November-December 1980): 15.
58. Laurence Green, et al., "The School Health Curriculum Project: Its Theory, Practice, and Measurement Experience," *Health Education Quarterly*, 7 (Spring 1980): 15.
59. Marvin Lavenhar, "Health Education Programs in New Jersey Public Schools," *The Journal of School Health*, 50 (August 1980): 346.
60. Nicholas Iammarino and Armin Weinberg, "The State of School Heart Health Education: A Review of the Literature," *Health Education Quarterly*, 7 (Winter 1980): 299.
61. Joyce Way, "Project Superheart: An Evaluation of a Heart Disease Intervention Program for Children," *Journal of School Health*, 51 (January 1981): 16.
62. Iammarino and Weinberg, p. 317.
63. Ellen Cohen and Carl Cohen, "A Birth Defects Prevention Curriculum for Inner-City Junior High School Students," *Journal of School Health*, 51 (February 1981): 97.
64. Donna Burnett Mangham and Connie Vickey, "Introducing Nutrition Education," *Journal of School Health*, 51 (February 1981): 110.
65. Reva Frankle, "It's Never Too Early for Nutrition Education," *Journal of School Health*, 50 (September 1980): 387.
66. Ibid., p. 391.
67. "School Sex Ed Required in Three States and D.C. But Most States Allow Local Districts to Decide," *Family Planning Perspectives*, 12 (November-December 1980): 307.

68. Melving Zelnick, "Sex Education and Knowledge of Pregnancy Risk Among U.S. Teenage Women," *Family Planning Perspectives*, 11 (November-December 1979): 355.
69. R. G. Amonker, "What Do Teens Know about the Facts of Life," *Journal of School Health*, 50 (November 1980): 527.
70. Douglas Kirby, "The Effects of School Sex Education Programs: A Review of the Literature," *Journal of School Health*, 50 (December 1980): 559.
71. Faye Peterson, "Closing the Immunization Gap," *FDA Consumer*, 11 (November 1977): 18.
72. Ibid.
73. Ibid., pp. 22-23.
74. Janice Hand, et al., "A Successful School Immunization Program—or Not?" *Journal of School Health*, 50 (January 1980): 50.
75. Ibid.
76. A. H. Drummond, "Lead Poisoning in Children," *Journal of School Health*, 51 (January 1981): 43.
77. "Early Detection of Heart Risk in Children Urged," *The Sacramento Bee*, 27 January 1981, p. A5.
78. Lynn Fossum and Lauralee Sorensen, "The Schools See It First: Child Abuse/Neglect," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (December 1980): 274.
79. Thomas Lombard, "A Lesson for Every State from Minnesota's Preschool Screening Program," *Journal of School Health*, 50 (October 1980): 459.
80. "Health Screening," *The Education Digest*, 45 (December 1979): 62-63.
81. Lombard, p. 459.
82. Ibid., p. 462.
83. Katherine Webster, "Planning and Implementing Health Screening Programs," *Journal of School Health*, 50 (November 1980): 495.
84. Reuben Warren, "A Community Approach: School-Based Health Care Delivery," *Journal of School Health*, 50 (October 1980): 463.
85. Claiborne Dungy, "Pediatric Nurse Practitioners in a School Based CHDP Program," *Journal of School Health*, 50 (February 1980): 76.
86. Ibid., p. 78.
87. Warren, p. 466.
88. Bess Buser, "The Evaluation of School Health Services: New York and Nationwide," *Journal of School Health*, 50 (October 1980): 477.
89. "Crime in Schools," *The Education Digest*, 45 (January 1980): 68.
90. "Discipline Problems," *The Education Digest*, 46 (October 1980): 67.
91. National Education Association, *Handbook 1979-80*, (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1979) p. 7.
92. "Breakfasts," *The Education Digest*, 45 (October 1979): 64.
93. "Junk Food," *The Education Digest*, 45 (September 1979): 64.
94. David Moberly, "Compulsory Attendance: A Second Look," *The Education Digest*, 45 (May 1980): 7.

95. Ibid., p. 9.
96. "Class Size Reconsidered," *The Education Digest*, 45 (November 1979): 67.
97. "Small Classes Not a Panacea, Says ERS, But Try Telling Teachers and Parents," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (October 1979): 84.

Chapter Three

1. George Neill, "Washington Report," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (November 1980): 165.
2. "Reagan Public School Aid Formula: Cut and Consolidate," *The Christian Science Monitor*, 12 March 1981, p. 7.
3. "The Tax Revolt Loses More Steam," *U.S. News and World Report*, 17 November 1980, p. 109.
4. The Council of State Government, *The Book of the States 1980-1*, (Lexington, Ky.: C.S.G., 1980), p. 356.
5. Gary Hoban, "The Untold Golden State Story: Aftermath of Proposition 13," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (September 1979): 18.
6. Ibid., p. 20
7. Michael W. Kirst and Walter I. Garms, "Public School Finance in the 1980s," *The Education Digest*, 46 (December 1980): 6.
8. "A First: States Spend Most for School Support," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 60 (April 1979): 555.
9. Ibid.
10. "Tax Exemption," *The Education Digest*, 45 (May 1980): 60.
11. "Revenue Sharing," *The Education Digest*, 45 (May 1980): 58.
12. Ibid.
13. Chris Pipho, "State Legislatures and the Schools," *Educational Leadership*, 38 (November 1980): 125.
14. Neill, p. 165.
15. Pipho, p. 127.
16. Ibid.
17. The Rand Corporation, "Equity: School Reform's Elusive Goal," *The Education Digest*, 45 (October 1979): 56.
18. Ibid.
19. Susan Fuhrman, "School Finance Reform in the 1980s," *Educational Leadership*, 38 (November 1980): 122.
20. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *The Condition of Education, Part I*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1980) p. 279.
21. Eugene McLoone, "Disparities in Per Pupil Resources," *American Education*, 16 (March 1980).
22. NCES, p. 281.

23. Robert Berne and Leanna Stiefel, "The Equity of School Finance Systems Over Time: The Value Judgments Inherent in Evaluation," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15 (Spring 1979): 14.
24. Thomas Timar and James Guthrie, "Public Values and Public School Policy in the 1980s," *Educational Leadership*, 38 (November 1980): 112-113.
25. Rand Corporation, pp. 57-58.
26. Bruce Johnston, "Equality in Public School Financing: Missouri's Need for Reform," *Urban Law Review*, 1980, p. 134, fn. 7.
27. Council of State Governments, p. 357.
28. Eugene McLoone, "Index of State Effort," *American Education*, 16 (May 1980).
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Johnston, p. 135, fn. 7.
32. Timar and Guthrie, p. 113.
33. Ibid.
34. Rand Corporation, pp. 56-58.
35. Johnston, p. 155, fn. 115.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., p. 159.
39. Timar and Guthrie, p. 114.
40. Joseph Pechman, ed., *Brookings Institution: Setting National Priorities, 1979 Budget*, (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1978), p. 119.
41. Ibid., p. 125.
42. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Almanac 1980*, (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1981) p. 1811.
43. Martha J. Jacobs, "An Update: Who Would Benefit from Tuition Tax Credits," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (June 1980): 679.
44. Ibid., p. 681.
45. John E. Coons, "Of Family Choice and 'Public' Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (September 1979): 12.
46. Paul Skerry, "Vouchers and Family Choice," *Regulation*, 3 (July-August 1979): 50.
47. Coons, p. 13.
48. Donald Erickson, "Should *All* the Nation's Schools Compete for Clients and Support," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (September 1979): 14.
49. Coons, p. 12.

Chapter Four

1. W. Timothy Weaver, "In Search of Quality: The Need for Talent in Teaching," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (September 1979): 30.

2. Chris Pipho, "The NAEP Conference on Minimum Competency Testing," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (October 1979): 123.
3. Gene Lyons, "Why Teachers Can't Teach," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 108.
4. Veronica Huang Li, "Foreign Languages: Tongue-Tied Americans," *Editorial Research Reports*, 19 (September 1980): 691.
5. Stuart D. Milner, "Teaching Teachers about Computers: A Necessity for Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (April 1980): 544.
6. Renee Rudolph Levine, "An Assessment of High School Nutrition Education," *Journal of Nutrition Education*, 11 (July-September 1979): 126.
7. Dale L. Womble and Eileen Barnes Yeakley, "A Review of the Academic Preparation of Some Indiana Secondary School Family Life Educators and the State's New Certification Requirements," *Family Relations*, 29 (April 1980): 151.
8. George Gallup, "The Eleventh Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (September 1979): 39.
9. Walter Hathaway, "Testing Teachers," *Educational Leadership*, 38 (December 1980): 210.
10. Ibid., p. 211.
11. Ibid., p. 210.
12. Ibid., p. 213.
13. Homer Coker, et al., "How Valid are Expert Opinions about Effective Teaching," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 131.
14. David Seeley, "Reducing the Confrontation over Teacher Accountability," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (December 1979): 248-251.
15. Hathaway, p. 215.
16. Coker, p. 131.
17. Hathaway, p. 211.
18. Coker, p. 132.
19. Hathaway, p. 211.
20. "Civille Right," *The Washington Post*, 28 September 1979.
21. The Editor's Page, "Minimum Competency Tests for Teachers: Confusion Compounded," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (December 1979): 233.
22. Gallup, p. 39.
23. Chad D. Ellett, et al., "Assessing Teacher Performance," *Educational Leadership*, 38 (December 1980): 219.
24. Hathaway, p. 212.
25. Ibid., pp. 212-213.
26. "Number of New Teachers Expected to Shrink," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61 (May 1980): 587.
27. "Teacher Shortages," *Education Digest*, 45 (October 1979): 66.
28. Sandra Cooke and Jeanette Moss, "How Troubled Is Teacher Education," *Teacher*, 98 (November-December 1980): 30.
29. Weaver, p. 32.

30. Cooke and Moss, p. 30.
31. Harold G. Shane, "An Educational Forecast for the 1980s" *Education Digest*, 45 (October 1979): 3.
32. B. Othanel Smith, "Pedagogical Education: How About Reform?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 87.
33. Ibid., p. 89.
34. Cooke and Moss, p. 29.
35. Ibid., p. 31.
36. Doyle Watts, "Admissions Standards for Teacher Preparatory Programs: Time for a Change," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 120.
37. Bruce Peseau and Paul Orr, "The Outrageous Underfunding of Teacher Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 100.
38. Smith, p. 88.
39. Cooke and Moss, p. 31.
40. Ibid.
41. Watts, p. 121.
42. Lyn Gubser, "NCATE's Director Comments on the Tom Critique," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 117.
43. Val D. Rust, "Can Teacher Education Centers Facilitate School Development?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 122.
44. David Lisman, "Mandatory Continuing Education and Teachers," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 125.
45. Ibid., p. 125
46. Smith, p. 87.
47. Lisman, p. 126.
48. Rust, p. 122.
49. Lisman, p. 126.
50. William H. Drummond and Theodore E. Andrews, "The Influence of Federal and State Governments on Teacher Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (October 1980): 99.
51. Ibid., p. 99.
52. Smith, p. 90.
53. John Ryor, "Teacher Centers," *Today's Education*, 68 (April-May 1979): 5.
54. Drummond and Andrews, p. 98.
55. Robert C. Blackmon, "The Coming Push for Control of Teacher Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 60 (October 1978): 134.
56. Hathaway, p. 215.
57. Ibid.
58. Paul L. Trachtenberg, "Legal Issues in the Testing of School Personnel," *Phi Delta Kappan* 57 (May 1976).
59. Chris Pipho, "State Legislatures and the Schools," *Educational Leadership*, 38 (November 1980): 127.
60. Joyce Killian, et al., "Last Call for Professional Self-Improvement," *Educational Leadership*, 38 (December 1980): 222.

61. Robert J. Munnelly, "Dismissal for Professional Incompetence," *Education Digest*, 45 (November 1979): 11.
62. Ibid.
63. "Remediation Works," *Education Digest*, 45 (November 1979): 68.
64. Denis Doyle, "Public Policy and Private Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62 (September 1980): 16.
65. Smith, p. 87.

Chapter Five

1. Ronald L. Applbaum, et al., *The Process of Group Communication*, (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1974): 276-277.
2. Joseph Kramer, *Environment/Ecology: A Guide to the Library*, (Sacramento, Calif.: Library, 1972): 6.
3. Mora McCormick, *The New York Times Guide to Reference Materials*, (New York: Fawcett Popular Library, 1979).
4. Laurence Schmeckebier, and Roy B. Eastin, *Government Publications and Their Use*, rev. ed., (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1969).
5. Eugene P. Sheehy, *Guide to Reference Books, 9th ed.*, (Chicago: American Library Association, 1976).
6. *Information Please Almanac 1981*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1980): 731-734.
7. David L. Wagner, *ERIC First Analysis: Consumer Interests, 1980-81 National High School Debate Resolutions*, (Falls Church, Va.: ERIC/RCS and Speech Communication Association, 1980): 75.
8. Bill Henderson, *ERIC First Analysis: U.S. Foreign Policy, 1979-80 National High School Debate Resolutions*, (Falls Church, Va.: ERIC/RCS and Speech Communication Association, 1979): 71.

Selected Bibliography

Periodicals

Davis, C.G. "Mainstreaming Versus an Appropriate Education." *Yearbook of Special Education* 6 (1980–81): 133–7.

Dyrenfurth, M.J. "Vocational Data Reports: The Status of Industrial Arts." *Man Society Technology* 40 (November 1980): 16–19.

Florio, D.H. "Education Amendment of 1980: National Institute of Higher Education Act Reauthorization." *Educational Researcher* 9 (November 1980): 20-1+.

Hufstedler, S.M. "America's Historic Commitment." *American Educator* 16 (May 1980): 6–7.

Ianni, F.A.J., and E. Reuss-Ianni. "Crime and Social Order in Schools." *Education Digest* 45 (May 1980): 2–5.

Jacobs, N.C. "Helping Student Teachers Learn More about Mainstreaming." *Teacher Education* 16 (Summer 1980): 36–38.

Katz, B.S., et al. "Growth Prospects for the 1980's." *USA Today* 108 (June 1980): 5–6.

Kraig, A.B. "State of the Art—Instructional Technology." *International Journal of Instructional Media* 8 (1) (1980–81): 11–20.

"Minimum Competency Testing and Handicapped Students." *Yearbook of Special Education* 6 (1980–81): 73–91.

Okoh, S.E.N. "Education as a Source of Economic Growth and Development—An Essay." *Journal of Negro Education* 49 (Spring 1980): 203–6.

Richards, M.C. "Public Schools and the Education of the Whole Person." *Teachers College Record* 82 (Fall 1980): 47–75.

Rubel, R.J., ed. "Crime and Violence in Public Schools: Emerging Perspectives of the 1980's." *Contemporary Education* 52 (Fall 1980): 5–46.

Trimarco, T.A. "Schools: Are Parents the Key?" *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin* 46 (Summer 1980): 6–8.

Tyack, D.B. "Reformulating the Purposes of Public Education in an Era of Retrenchment." *Educational Studies* 11 (Spring 1980): 49–64.

White, H. "Changes in Priorities." *Clearing House* 54 (October 1980): 85–86.

Books

Aurich, Paul. *The Modern School Movement: Anarchism and Education.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Becker, James, ed. *Schooling for a Global Age.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Bridge, R.G., Judd, C.M., and Moock, P.R. *The Determination of Educational Outcomes: The Impact of Families, Peers, Teachers, and Schools.* Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1979.

Carnoyu, M. *Education and Employment: A Critical Appraisal.* Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning, 1977.

Cohn, E. *The Economics of Education, rev. ed.* Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1979.

Dulce, D.L. *The Retransformation of the School in the Emergence of Contemporary Alternative Schools in the U.S.* Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1978.

McMullen, T. *Innovative Practices in Secondary Education: The Lower Secondary Stage, Problems and Possibilities.* Paris: OECD (Washington, D.C.: OECD Publication), 1978.

Peterson, Penelope L., and Walberg, Herbert J., eds. *Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings and Implications.* Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1979.

Ragan, W.B., and Sheperd, G.D. *Modern Elementary Curriculum, 5th ed.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1977.

Saunders, R.J. *Relating Art and Humanities to the Classroom.* Dubuque, Iowa: W.C. Brown, 1977.

Savage, D.G. *Educating All the Handicapped: What the Law Says and What the Schools Are Doing.* Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Assn., 1977.

Schenck, E.A., and Gourley, R.N. *A Guide to Identifying Highschool Graduation Competencies: Issues and Examples.* Portland Ore.: Northwest Regional Education Lab., 1978.

Solmon, L.C., ed. *Reassessing the Link Between Work and Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Summary of Research on Middle Schools. Arlington, Va.: ERS Research Brief, 1978.

Wallhaus, R.A. *Measuring and Increasing Academic Productivity.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Government Documents

Brown, S.C. *Educational Attainment of Workers: Some Trends from 1973 to 1978.* Washington, D.C.: Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1979.

Fromboluti, C.S. *Title I: Elementary and Secondary Act: Questions and Answers.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

U.S. Government Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. *Opportunities for Indians in Vocational Education.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

U.S. Government Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. *State Leadership and the Federal Presence in Education: The Report of a Survey.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

U.S. Government Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Office of Career Education. Thomas Buffington et al., ed. *Follow the Yellow Brick Road*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

U.S. Government Federal Interagency Commission on Education. Subcommittee on Education. *Educational Service and Work: The Multi-Funded Approach*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977.

U.S. Government House of Representatives. *Hearings before Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, 95th Congress, 1st Session, on HR 15, To Extend for Five Years Certain Elementary, Secondary and Other Education Programs*. . . . Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.

U.S. Government National Advisory Council on Equality of Educational Opportunity. *Report—National Advisory Council on Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

U.S. Government Urban High School Reform Initiative. Thomas J. Burns et al. *Federal Educational Law and Urban Secondary School Reform*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.